DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 028 330 AC 003 727

By-Miller, Marilyn V., Ed.
On Teaching Adults: An Anthology.
Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, Brookline, Mass.
Pub Date May 60
Note-106p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$5.40
Descriptors-Adult Characteristics, *Adult Education, *Adult Educators, Adult Learning, *Adult Students, Age, Classroom Environment, College Faculty, *Educational Philosophy, Evening Colleges, Motivation, *Teacher Responsibility, Universities

The bulk of this anthology treats adults as different from adolescents, in learning and in other respects, and the resultant demands which these differences make upon flexible, conscientious teachers of adults. Three essays deal with an overall view of adult education, its challenges, problems, and rewards. Other essays are concerned with the position of the university in adult education, the pressures upon it from without and within, and the philosophy of education, (the nature of knowledge, the values of a liberal education, and an evaluation of both teaching and learning). Several articles discuss teachers of adults, the types of people they are, types of responsibilities they have, and the qualities that are appropriate to a good teacher. The nature of the adult, his roles, attitudes, learning abilities -- as well as general principles of good teaching of adults, including how adult teaching differs from other kinds of teaching and the limits of pedagogical authority -- are also considered. (se)

ED028330

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

NOTES AND ESSAYS ON EDUCATION FOR

32

SSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED
BY Doris Chertow
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

ON TEACHING ADULTS: AN ANTHOLOGY

Edited by MARILYN V. MILLER

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

NEWS LETTER

AC003727

PUBLICATIONS

CENTER *for the* STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS

PRICES

exceptions noted

DISCUSSION GUIDES	$1.00
REPORTS	Single copy free. Bulk rate quoted on request.
NOTES AND ESSAYS	Single copy free. Extras $0.25 per copy. Bulk rate quoted on request.
OFFPRINTS	Single copy free.

DISCUSSION GUIDES

Analytical Reading

International Political Behavior. $3.00

Looking at Pictures: A Guide to Intelligent Appreciation. $5.00

Our Modern Art: The Movies

Scientists at Work

Themes and Variations: An Invitation to Literature

Understanding Group Behavior

Ways of Mankind

REPORTS

Administrative Policies and Practices of Evening Colleges. 1953.

Why Students Drop Out: A Research Report

How Much Does Adult Experience Count? An Interim Report of the Brooklyn College Experiment

Adults Grow in Brooklyn. Report Number 2 of the Brooklyn College Experiment

Conference Reports: (1) *Evening College and Extension Administration as a Profession*, Chicago, Illinois, 1957; (2) *New Dimensions of University Responsibility for the Liberal Education of Adults*, Daytona Beach, Florida, 1956; (3) *The Changing University: A Report on the Seventh Annual Leadership Conference*, Chicago, Illinois, May 1959.

Adult Education and Adult Needs. 1956.

New Directions in Programming for University Adult Education. 1957.

Vassar Institute for Women in Business. 1957.

A Review of 1956: Center Activities and Projects. 1957.

A Review of 1957: Center Activities and Projects. 1958.

New Directions in Liberal Education for Executives. March 1958.

Ability and Achievement of Evening College and Extension Students. July 1959.

A Review of 1958: Future Directions of the Center and a Report of Current Activities. July 1959.

Cumulative Indexes: Association of University Evening Colleges Proceedings, 1948–58: National University Extension Association Proceedings, 1915–57. April, 1960

OFFPRINTS

Benne, Kenneth D. "Adult Education in a University," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. XXVII, Nos. 8 and 9 (November and December, 1956).

Diekhoff, John S. "The Alumni University," *Journal of Higher Education*, Vol. XXVIII, No. 7 (October, 1957).

Dyer, John P. "What Do We Fear?" *Adult Leadership*, March, 1956.

Gould, Samuel A. "Quality in Adult Education." Address to the Association of University Evening Colleges, Louisville, Kentucky, November 17, 1958.

James, T. F. "Adult Education," *Cosmopolitan*, September, 1957.

Kaplan, Abbott. "Liberal Education in a Business Civilization," *Research Developments in Personnel Management*, Proceedings of First Conference, University of California, Los Angeles.

Leys, Wayne A. R. "The Terminal Master's Degree," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 3 (Summer, 1956).

Love, Robert A. "AUEC Background—From Coffee to Capers to Educational Leadership," Association of University Evening Colleges *Newsletter*, Vol. VI, No. 1 (November, 1957).

Miller, Harry L. "What's Your Line? The Task of the Adult Educator," *Adult Leadership*, September, 1957.

(Continued on inside back cover)

ON TEACHING ADULTS:
AN ANTHOLOGY

Edited by MARILYN V. MILLER
Staff Assistant, Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults

CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS**

THE CENTER *for the* **STUDY OF LIBERAL EDUCATION FOR ADULTS** was established as the result of a grant from the Fund for Adult Education to work with the universities providing liberal education for adults. The official purpose of the Center is to "provide aid and leadership to the forces that can develop the evening college and extension movement into a more effective instrument for the liberal education of adults." Communications may be addressed to the Director, 4819 Greenwood Avenue, Chicago 15, Illinois.

Publications of the Center are listed on the inside covers, with information as to how they may be obtained.

Copyright 1960 by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. All rights reserved.

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

INTRODUCTION

There is a good deal of talk these days, in the journals and in the halls, about learning, teaching, students, and instructors, but we have found that there are very few volumes which attend exclusively to the teaching of adults. When the suggestion is made that adults should be taught "differently," a howl conventionally goes up that this is superfluous discussion, for a good teacher is a good teacher is a good teacher, no matter the age of his students. While we agree that this is so, it is nonetheless true—and a fact emphasized frequently below in precisely these words—that adults have more experiences, of different kinds, and differently organized from those which non-adults accumulate. So you will find that the bulk of this anthology treats adults as different from adolescents, in learning and in other respects, and the resultant demands which these differences make upon flexible, conscientious teachers of adults. Although many of these essays have been distributed separately by the Center, we collect them here for those administrators and faculty members of evening colleges and extension divisions who have wished for a compendium about learning and teaching as these relate specifically to adult students.

We have had some ideas about ways to use this collection and will enumerate them below, but people who reviewed the draft indicated one unanticipated utility: they promptly asked for several dozen copies with which to blanket top administration in their institutions. We agree with them that this anthology underscores a too-little-known fact: that there is a field of adult education and of adult teaching about which intelligent people think carefully (see John Schwertman's persuasive explication of "The Intellectual Challenge of Adult Education"). Copies of this collection now appear on the desks of top administrators, board members, degree committee members, department chairmen, and policy committees. It is to be hoped that as institutional policy makers grow more convinced of adult education as a field receiving thoughtful study, adult divisions will benefit.

Both administrators and faculty members might of course use this collection more directly to greater profit—at the very least, say, as interesting and readable material. Or administrators of adult education divisions might like to take a look at what Kenneth Benne, John Diekhoff, and Harry Miller have to say about some administrative problems. And instructors developing their first courses for adult students would benefit by having available particularly the reflections of David Jenkins, Peter Siegle, Bernard Stern, and Richard Thain.

However, a more widely appropriate use of the essays would surely be as background reference, working papers, impetus for any conversations about effective adult education—seminars on improving instruction, meetings of administration and faculty to discuss adult divisions generally and teaching of adults particularly; in-service training programs for faculty (John Diekhoff suggests elements for such in-service training on p. 90). An illustrative sample of discussable subjects follows, and each of these general areas might provide topics for several seminars. Also, discussions of these topics should be possible either on the level of practical debates about problems and techniques or on the level of reflective considerations of philosophy and theory. For example:

An over-all view of the field of adult education, its challenges, problems, and rewards (Schwertman, Benne, McLeish). The position of the university in adult education, and pressures upon it from without and within (Benne, Diekhoff).

Philosophy of education. The nature of knowledge; the core of a curriculum; the values of a liberal education (McLeish, Benne). The goals of liberal adult education (McLeish, Schueler) and evaluation of both teaching and learning (Schueler).

Teachers of adults. Why should they be interested in adult education (Schwertman)? What kinds of people are they (Diekhoff)? What responsibilities have they (Miller, Diekhoff, McLeish, Schueler)? Why are they resistant to change (Miller, Diekhoff)? What rewards are there, especially for the new teacher (Thain, Diekhoff)? What qualities are appropriate to a good teacher of adults (Miller, McLeish, Schueler)?

The nature of the adult. What is he like as a prospective student; what are his roles, attitudes, learning abilities, experience (all of the authors, and particularly McLeish, Schueler, Jenkins, Siegle, Stern, Diekhoff)?

General principles of good teaching of adults (McLeish, Schueler, Stern, Diekhoff). How does adult teaching differ from other kinds of teaching (Schueler, Diekhoff, Miller, Thain)? Limits of pedagogical authority (Benne, McLeish).

Learning theory. Components of "good" intellectual and emotional learning (Jenkins, Siegle, Rogers).

As such a catalog indicates, most of these articles talk about the same things, although from different points of view. Since we find them instructive and provocative, we hope that they will inform, interest, and stimulate —and there is evidence from those who made a preliminary examination of this collection in draft form that it in fact can prompt useful and lively debate. For cumulatively, these essays reinforce each other in the conviction, which we share, that teaching of adults is different, demanding, exhilarating, and important.

Marilyn Vaughan Miller, Editor
Staff Assistant, Center for the Study
of Liberal Education for Adults

May, 1960

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

The Intellectual Challenge of Adult Education
John B. Schwertman 1

Why Don't We Have Better Teaching for Adults
Harry L. Miller 9

Adult Education in the University
Kenneth D. Benne 15

The Philosophical Basis of Adult Education
J. McLeish 27

The Method of Adult Education
Herbert Schueler 41

Conditions Underlying Good Learning
David H. Jenkins 53

The Adult Learner
Peter E. Siegle 62

Personal Thoughts on Teaching and Learning
Carl R. Rogers 68

The Teaching of Adults
Bernard H. Stern 71

The Teacher of Adults
John S. Diekhoff 77

Teaching on the Swing Shift
Richard J. Thain 92

THE INTELLECTUAL CHALLENGE OF ADULT EDUCATION

John B. Schwertman

John B. Schwertman was Director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults from 1953 until his death in 1956. Prior to his directorship of the Center, he had been Assistant to the President of Roosevelt University in Chicago.

I. The Need To See Adult Education as an Intellectual Challenge

Our research enables us to identify some common views of adult education held by college teachers. I am not citing types of teachers; these are types of views.

The first is the "hobby lobby" view. This is the view of adult education as courses in arts, crafts. upholstering, woodworking, figurine painting and whatnot. The hobby advocates are viewed as zealots who have "taken over" adult education.

The second view of adult education I would call "Howtoism"—ranging from how to read faster, to such things as how a male can survive middle age with his superego intact, "how to be a woman," etc. If the "hobby lobby" view is to be associated with the YMCA's and the public school adult programs, "Howtoism" is the product of the age of Dale Carnegie, psychosomatics, Norman Vincent Peale, and Americans wanting to go abroad without appearing to be the kind of persons de Tocqueville said they were.[1]

A third view is that adult educators care only about "Giving 'em what they want." I suspect that this view assumes that college teachers really know what adults need.

---

[1] For a remarkable description of his "Howtoism" phenomena, I commend Dwight MacDonald's New Yorker piece on the subject (May 22, 1954).

A fourth view holds that adult education and group dynamics are synonymous. This view of course presumes a knowledge of what group dynamics is; it also presumes that there is something unacademic about the direct social action with which group dynamics is often concerned.[2]

A fifth is the "fly-tying" view. Those who hold this view voice loud alarm when a university adult program offers a course in "fly-tying," but are silent when the same course in the day college is offered as "Physical Education."

Adult education as intellectual entertainment is a sixth view growing out of the Lyceum and Chautauqua movements and is currently found in attitudes toward the Great Books. Adult education is seen as the kind of thing that ladies with little feathers in their hats trap reluctant husbands into by appealing to their upward mobility drives.

Finally, I would cite the view of adult education, especially in the university, as a kind of academic "Siberia." The evening college or extension division is seen as a good place to park excess teaching personnel, to sentence a deviate to, or to relieve the pressure on the day department's tenure situation.

I am not suggesting either approval of or opposition to these views but pointing to their real existence. Assuming, however, that adult education is "here to stay," there seems to be an acute need for a more intellectually satisfying view of its significance.

II. Why Should College Teachers Be Interested in Adult Education?

There are two compelling reasons, at different levels.

First, at what I call "the belly level," college teachers would do well to realize that adult education has become of crucial importance in the economic survival of the American university, and especially the private institution. Adult education programs make money: they produce an excess of income over direct expenditure. In most of the universities, adult enrollments exceed all the day division enrollments combined. In short, the jobs of many college teachers today depend upon adult enrollments.

---

[2] For a thoughtful statement on the role of the academic in social action research, see Ronald Lippitt's "Value-Judgment Problems of the Social Scientist in Action Research," a paper read at the 1950 meetings of the American Psychology Association.

Purely in terms of "bread & butter" welfare, cynicism and disinterest would seem ill advised. The argument, I believe, becomes more cogent when we realize the vast, potential, untapped market for adult education.

There is, fortunately, a second reason, on a higher level, for college teachers to be interested in adult education. This reason is that adult education can be a tremendous intellectual challenge. The role of adult education in our kind of society has the greatest implications for the conditions under which we work, live, and teach. As a respectable field of intellectual inquiry, adult education can well demand a professional commitment from at least some college teachers.

III. Three Areas of Intellectual Challenge

Adult education provides at least three main areas of intellectual challenge:

First, the adult himself is an interesting challenge. Existing research does not tell us much about adulthood. In this century we have learned much about pre-natal and post-natal human development; from 1915 on we developed a rich literature of knowledge about early childhood and adolescence. Then recently, and for some strange reason, we skipped over the ages from 21 to 65 and got interested in the problems of an aging population. Since the war, gerontology has developed a considerable literature and has become recognized as a legitimate area of social, medical, psychological, and economic inquiry. Even the patent medicine ads attest to this: cod liver oil and Castoria have given way to Hadacol and Geritol. Interest in growth and glands has developed a new focus, not on the adolescent but on the aged. Child labor problems give way to "Ham & Eggs" schemes as political issues. But "normal adulthood," especially the ages between 28 and 45 and the period of middle-age between 45 and 60, remains largely unexplored.

Robert J. Havighurst states that adulthood is the terra incognita of the social scientist.[3] He proposes that one way to understand adults is to study the social roles which they must fulfill. He proposes ten such roles which most of us are expected to play—worker, parent, consumer of leisure time, etc. He wants to know about the qualitative changes within roles, and about the changing relationship between roles, as adults grow older. For example, in terms of the adult learning process, it would seem of considerable interest to know more precisely what happens psychologically when one's children grow up, how consumption of leisure time changes with age, the emotional affects of being "over the hill" physically, implications of a male adult's sudden awareness that his career has entered some kind of "levelling off" process.

---

[3] See Havighurst, "The Social Roles of the Middle-Aged Person," Notes and Essays, No. 4 (Chicago: The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1953).

Some crucial changes occur between the ages of 38 and 50, a period Cyril O. Houle refers to as "the adolescence of maturity." Professor Houle, one of the few university people to make a scholarly commitment to adult education, points out three basic ways in which adulthood differs from youth in the human life cycle: (1) Adults have more experiences; (2) Adults have different kinds of experiences; and (3) The life experiences of adults are organized differently.

Dr. Raymond Kuhlen, Syracuse University psychologist, is another of the few who have made a professional commitment to studying adults. Summarized below are a few of his more important findings:[4]

The Learning Ability of Adults

Thorndike and others have pointed out that the peak age period of the ability to learn new things is between ages 20 and 26. But learning ability does not decline sharply with age; the drop is gradual. It is also more probably due to the factor of disuse rather than to any deterioration in organic powers. Furthermore, the data deal only with the peak of learning ability, which is not so important, perhaps, because people seldom have to call upon the maximum of their learning powers.

Age is only one factor in adult learning ability. Interest, motivation, and a host of intangibles are the more important factors that make for learning and production. Hence, data suggest that a person's peak age for work production does not correspond to his peak age for learning (20 to 26), but occurs between the ages of 30 and 40.

---

[4] Summary of remarks by Dr. Kuhlen, addressed to the Syracuse University Faculty Seminar on Adult Education, Pinebrook, N.Y., May 21, 1954. This Seminar was jointly sponsored by the University and The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults.

Personality and Motivational Factors in Adulthood[5]

Kuhlen identified the following phenomena as being of major importance in adulthood:

1. Adults do not easily change their habits or attitudes, as Kallen has pointed out.[6] But Kuhlen remarks, "Despite this, it does seem that there is a growth-urge that persists throughout life."

2. Adult goals do change; needs and roles change. Vocational advancement seems to give way to cultural concerns. As an adult grows older, he appears to need "something more" than vocational satisfactions.[7] The kind of work he does seems to be quite influential in determining the changes that take place.

3. Adults want educational experiences that are realistically related to daily problems. They are more realistic than undergraduates. Short courses seem more desirable than semester-long courses. And there is evidence to suggest that adults seek educational experiences other than lectures, formal courses, and the like.

4. As compared with adolescents, adults are subject to more conflicting pressures. For example, an adult may experience a pressure to go to school for job advancement but at the same time experience pressure to be home at nights to help care for the children or a sick wife. Kuhlen suspects that the serious drop-out rate in adult education is due more to these conflicting pressures than to dissatisfaction with the quality of the educational experience.[8]

5. There comes a point at which adults view their future as now.

---

[5] See Kuhlen and others, The Psychology of Human Development, and Pressy, Janney and Kuhlen, Life: A Psychological Survey (New York: Harpers, 1939). See also Harvey Lehman's Age and Achievement (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1953).

[6] Horace Kallen, "The Liberation of the Adult," Notes and Essays, No. 7 (Chicago: The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1954).

[7] See Pressy, Janney and Kuhlen, op. cit., ch. 7, pp. 220ff., and Peter E. Siegle, "Mountains, Plateaus, and Valleys in Adult Learning," Adult Education, IV, No. 4 (March 1954).

[8] See James T. Carey, Why Students Drop Out: A Study of Evening College Students' Motivations (Chicago: The Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1953), p. 18.

Attempts to "extend the future" occur by means of such things as:

a. Interest in geneology;

b. Identification with their children;

c. Increased concern with immortality. For example, whereas advancing age brings about a decrease in many kinds of activities, church activity holds up, and often increases. This, according to Kuhlen, makes the church a very important agency of adult education.

6. As age advances, adults tend to feel threatened by any number of situations, but most importantly by such things as change and tests of their capacity.[9] These feelings of threat lead to the avoidance of behavioral change. Unknown ventures are initially unwelcomed; situations loaded with the unexpected are avoided. Kuhlen feels that these threatening tendencies suggest that, as they get older, adults need experiences that help them to be "forward looking," and, in particular, that teachers of adults must be sensitized to these existing tendencies of adults to be threatened.

To all this, the hard-boiled college teacher might say, "So what?" But I would suggest to him that the evidence indicates that the American adult is a pretty interesting specimen, and when he sees the adult in his classroom I hope he views him as something more than an adolescent who missed the matriculation process as a teenager. For some teachers what I have cited may also suggest some challenging research, especially concerning ways of adapting one's own teaching materials to adult needs. For all teachers there would seem to be educational justification for becoming sensitive to the challenges of adult teaching.

I now turn briefly to a second area of intellectual challenge which the education of adults presents. Recently I talked to a literature teacher about his experience in his university evening college. "It's the sociology of this thing that fascinates me," he said. It was his use of the term "sociology" that fascinated me. By this, I think he meant the profound societal implications of the increasing number and the kind of adults coming to his evening classes.

---

[9] This would tend to confirm my observation (from interviewing material) that adults fear course grades, while at the same time they want to be evaluated. That is, although they put demands on the instructor to let them know "How am I doing?", they resent being compared with fellow students.

I won't labor this point but instead refer you to a rather rich and recent literature which, more eloquently than I can, will show the reason why adult education is an intellectual challenge. You would, I am sure, be interested in such works as Riesman and Denney's books, The Lonely Crowd and Faces in the Crowd, Eli Ginzberg's Occupational Choice, C. Wright Mills's White Collar and The Power Elite, Kallen's The Liberation of the Adult, the researches of Everett G. Hughes of Chicago, the work of Merton and others on the sociology of the professions, the studies of Alison Davis and his colleagues on the social class influences upon learning, the work of Lloyd Warner and his associates, and of course the classic Middletown studies of Robert and Helen Lynd. While much of this literature is of course relevant to undergraduate teaching, it has some sharp implications especially for adult education.

Finally, I cite a third area in which adult education offers us an intellectual challenge, the area of our own specialized subject matter. By and large, our subject matter in university adult education is imported lock, stock, and barrel from the day curricula. It is enmeshed in an elaborate system of rewards and punishments: credits, pre-requisites, sequences, degree requirements, exams, and the like, and often fails, therefore, to truly involve the adult student.

Can the greatest that man has thought and said and done be "translated" into terms that are meaningful and relevant in adult education? Can this be done without prostituting scholarship? Can the teaching of humanities to adults be different without being inferior? We must look to the teachers for answers. Our main hope is that in struggling with the problems involved they will see adult education as a challenge, not a chore.

There is much talk of the "popularity" of science, psychology, and the like. There is much bemoaning the state of the humanities. An English teacher said to me last winter, "The only way I can get adults to take my evening college course on Hamlet is to bill it as a Freudian analysis. Then they come." Another faculty member complained that his course on "Adolescence" did not draw students until he packed the parents in by calling it "The Turbulent Teens."

But should we really feel contemptuous of this kind of success? Is it necessarily unscholarly to be meaningful and relevant? Every subject matter has its own dynamic as well as its own discipline. Knowledge is not static, new dimensions are ever appearing. Freud has given new dimensions to all of literature; he has introduced to the classics a new level of reality. Expanded world order imposes new subject matters upon political theory. Dewey and Einstein have certainly added new conceptualizations to philosophy and science—Dewey by emphasizing the conflict or problematic situation as basic to learning and thinking, Einstein by pointing out how defective were Newtonian tools for the understanding of the universe. In education itself, the American concept of universal education for all, demands, at the least, that Cardinal Newman be re-read. As Whitehead pointed out, knowledge, like fish, does not keep fresh.

I have, I hope, pointed out the need for more intellectually satisfying concepts of adult education, and perhaps I have been successful in persuading you that such concepts can derive from the fascinating nature and needs of the American adult, from the "Big Changes" that our democratic and industrial society has produced and is producing, and finally from the challenge to make our subject matters, especially humanities, more meaningful and relevant.

WHY DON'T WE HAVE BETTER TEACHING FOR ADULTS?

Harry L. Miller

Harry L. Miller is Assistant Director for Research at the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. He has been Publications Committee Chairman of the Adult Education Association.

With the exception of money, there is probably no subject which haunts the conversation of administrators of adult education enterprises so much as faculty and teaching. This is understandable, for the institutions they administer deal in only one commodity—learning.

They do not administer large government and industrial funds for research into everything from cosmic rays to shop foremen. They are not in the business of producing elaborate and expensive entertainment for alumni and the populace at large. Nor need they worry about the moral and religious well-being of large numbers of adolescents placed in their tender care by parents still holding the other end of an umbilical cord.

With only a few exceptions—and to a far greater extent than their parent colleges and universities—the major activity of the university or college administrator of adult programs is obtaining the best possible instruction for the best program he can devise. Depending on his situation, and the imagination and talents of his staff, the kind of program will vary considerably; but no matter what form it takes, his responsibility for providing competent teaching is nowhere denied.

But if everyone talks about teaching, and how to make it more suitable to the special clientele of the adult divisions, it remains sadly true that very little is done about it. There have been a number of excellent

---

This essay consists of panel discussion remarks at a meeting of the Ohio Colleges Association at Columbus, Ohio, April 21, 1956. It appeared in Adult Education, VII, No. 2 (Winter 1957).

programs for college teachers in the last quarter century, many of them financed liberally by foundations. But, in general, there has been little organized, consistent, in-service training to help teachers deal with special problems of the adult classroom. I would like, therefore, to analyze the problem in terms of the forces which tend to keep the situation at its present level, and present some of these barriers as I see them. Later I hope we may find it productive to discuss them in the light of two questions: How real are the barriers described? And if they are real, what can be done to overcome them?

Why Don't Teachers Change?

Let me first focus on some of the attitudes and beliefs commonly found among teachers, and turn later to those which seem more relevant to administrators.

The most important barrier to improving instruction, I think, is the self-image of the college instructor as an entrepreneur of research. This is neither reprehensible nor inexcusable, to be sure. The university does have a primary responsibility for advancing knowledge, and if it did not train its young men and women in the skills and attitudes necessary to carry out the function, no other social institution would. The problem is that the self-image is too narrowly developed and is likely to carry over into the classroom.

The adult administrator does not need research entrepreneurs; he needs a manager for a learning enterprise. It is not difficult to see why this is a very hard nut to crack. All of the rewards in the academic system, the status, pay, and recognition, are channeled to the successful and industrious researcher. That is, indeed, why the self-image developed as it did. We cannot offer comparable rewards, but perhaps there is some pool of motivation we can tap to broaden the teacher's view of what it is important for him to be. Perhaps we can make use of some of the older teachers with status who have themselves developed through the years a belief in the importance of good teaching.

At the Center for which I work we have run a number of national and regional faculty seminars to discuss the development of new curriculum and teaching approaches for adults. The results of these seminars indicate that for many a teacher the challenge itself, once the possibilities are known and discussed, is enough to change somewhat the frame of reference from which he views his teaching job.

Partly because this emphasis on research results in ignoring the need to train for teaching, many college teachers are insecure about teaching.

Insecurity a Barrier

This insecurity is the second barrier I want to mention, and I suspect that as you consult your memories of instructors in your institutions you will not believe in its existence. I well remember a colleague of mine who, after a meeting with a faculty group to plan an improvement-of-instruction program, snarled, "How can you improve perfection?"

Yet, below this surface, this bland assumption of perfection that so many instructors exhibit, lies considerable insecurity. What other basis could there be for the quite common resistance to class visitation, to any process of evaluation? Why do instructors so readily and so fiercely blame students for failure to learn, as though they, the teachers, had no responsibility for the learning process? Why do they so absolutely reject change to methods for whose effectiveness a great deal of evidence exists?

Now insecurity can be dealt with only by increasing feelings of adequacy. So this barrier is closely linked with the third one I now want to mention, a fairly widespread lack of knowledge about the learning process, and a low level of skill in the activities necessary for teaching.

Lack of Training

It is a pity, since lecturing is the standard teaching device at the college level, that it is a very difficult art to master. Yet many college teachers who lecture very poorly fail to vary the method with other techniques which might be more appropriate to some learning tasks.

I went to a first-rate undergraduate college many years ago, but can recall only vaguely most of my classroom experiences there. One which I do remember vividly, however, occurred in a course on modern economic theories, when a teacher turned the class into a meeting of commissars in a socialist state, and made us work through a problem in economic planning. What I learned of the complexity of such a planning effort has never left me. Here was a teacher who had the necessary skill to carry through a learning activity which was precisely appropriate to the learning desired.

Unfortunately, the last two restraints I have discussed tend to reinforce each other. Insecurity too often leads to expressions of competence which make difficult any increase of knowledge or acquisition of skill. And lack of skill breeds continuing insecurity and a clinging to known, and therefore, safe, classroom practices.

Nevertheless, this is the area in which we can do most work in changing the entire situation. I know of no full-scale, in-service program for the training of teachers of adults, though there have been sporadic efforts. The manuals which many evening colleges have developed are a step in the right direction, but cannot hope to succeed in increasing by very much the level of skill.

In any field, skill is increased by experimenting with new patterns of behavior, then practicing them until learned. Beginning nurses, I understand, gain skill in hypodermic injections by practicing on oranges, which don't scream with pain when the angle is wrong. We need to find ways of providing practice situations for teachers, training situations in which they can practice new skills without hurting their students, or their own sensibilities.

Facts of Life for Administrators

Now let's look at some of the barriers present among administrators. The one which comes to mind immediately, and which is widely used as a reason for doing nothing about all the others, is the environment of the adult college or division. The hard facts are that most teachers of adults are part-time, that they do not have established lines of communication to the administration, that they are not in any real sense a group and are often unwilling to give further time and attention to a task which is peripheral to their central concerns.

All of this is true and yet need not induce a paralysis of effort. A number of ingenious administrators have found ways of getting around such obstinate facts of life. Syracuse, for instance, takes large groups of its faculty to a fairly luxurious spot in the mountains for a week end once or twice a year. I shall be interested in any less expensive ideas that may be suggested for overcoming this particular obstacle.

Second, the helping hand of the administrator is often stayed by his own belief that teaching is an art. God save us from being plunged into a semantic quarrel over whether it is art or something else unspecified.

What I want to protest against is that having used the magic word "art" to describe teaching, we shrug our shoulders and say, "In that case, there's nothing we can do about it except hire artists." Even if it were an art, my general impression is that no artist ever became successful without an enormous amount of rigorous training in his art, and continual submission to very tough criticism from his peers and mentors. Another way of looking at teaching, however, is to compare it to a practical activity such as engineering, which is based on the sciences of mathematics, physics, and chemistry, but is not itself a science. If teaching can be analogized to such professions fruitfully, it may be regarded as a practical activity based on whatever sciences of behavior are relevant to learning. I assume here that the teacher knows his subject thoroughly; I am now talking about his effectiveness in communicating it to people in a group. Let me say that I think that this latter view of teaching can be a much more productive one for us to take if we are interested in improving it.

Another restraint common among administrators is their own insecurity in the role of "judge" of teaching. Many, I would suspect the majority, make no attempt to evaluate the teaching done in their institutions. A few make some effort to find out. One man I know makes a practice of standing outside the classroom and listening over the transom, with, I suspect, an air of furtiveness. But, most administrators to whom I have talked tell me that they rely on student complaints, or on the judgment of the day division department chairmen. Now, this is a rather strange way of abdicating one's responsibility for seeing to it that a level of competent teaching is maintained. The random student who complains may have the worst possible motive for his judgment, and the department chairman is likely never to have seen the man teach. Perhaps what needs to be done here is to organize the evaluation of teaching in such a way that the adult administrator does not feel that he personally is on the spot.

Finally, there is the willingness of many, if not most, administrators to accept without much question the assertion of college teachers that training in teaching is not only not needed by them, but is the worst horror one can conceive. Look at the horrible teaching that goes on in our public schools, they say, and all the courses in education these teachers have been through. In my home university, the street that divides the teacher's college and the rest of the university is called "the widest street in the world." Surely it is a street that can be bridged if we can admit both that the teacher must be a scholar and that he must have skill in humanizing, putting to human use, his knowledge. This skill, an exacting, complex, but learnable one, we can help him acquire if we are ingenious enough to remove the barriers in the way.

ADULT EDUCATION IN THE UNIVERSITY

Kenneth D. Benne

Kenneth D. Benne, presently Theodore W. Berenson Professor of Human Relations and Director of the Human Relations Center at Boston University, is a past editor of Adult Leadership, and a former president of the Adult Education Association.

A "Primitive" Look at the University System

The role in which I am approaching the American university is that of a participant observer. You may think of me as a member of a primitive culture who has been extensively studied and restudied by anthropologists from American universities. Having acquired their techniques and some at least of their jargon, I have come to America to study the university, home bailiwick of most cultural anthropologists, sympathetically yet detachedly, as a social system.

The American university, as a social system, is a complexly organized activity, which is set off by more or less clear-cut boundaries from other social systems in the society. The most consistent central concern of people in this social system is to achieve, maintain, and extend a more-than-normal accuracy and refinement of statement and symbolic formulation. This concern may focus on any of several special aspects of culture and experience.

The serious student of a social system examines the intake and output of its populations. As I observe the university, there is a relatively small resident population particularly dedicated to its central preoccupation with accurate statements and refined symbolic formulations. There are three sizable migrant populations which move into and out of the university. The largest one of them is made up of young people, late adolescents, who spend a good share of their time, their waking hours at least,

---

Reprinted from Journal of Higher Education, XXVII, No. 8 (November 1956).

in contact with members of the resident population. The residents always regard the members of this group with more or less suspicion and distrust, because they represent "foreign" social systems and alien standards that are intruding upon the "purity" of university life. Yet the residents make some large part of their living by trying to communicate to these young migrants respect for the accurate and refined use of various symbolic mediums. In industrial organizations, an elaborate informal organization of workers usually indicates resistance to management influence. The extremely intricate and complex informal organizations of undergraduates at American universities also indicate, I believe, some degree of successful resistance against faculty influence upon their ways of expression and thought.

The second group of migrants is a smaller population of devotees to the ways of university life. These are people who were successfully "enculturated" (contaminated or purified, according to the point of view) as undergraduates and who now aspire to join the university. They are usually called graduate students. Over a period of time, they become more and more indistinguishable, in their ways of valuing, thinking, and talking, from the resident population, at least from that segment of it which they are cultivating in a major way. The attitude of the residents toward these migrants is commonly quite different from the attitude toward most undergraduates. The residents give them some willing attention; they are even willing to exploit them in terms of their own research and publications! Ultimately, some of these graduate students come to replace or augment the resident population in this or other universities. Since it is quite understandable that the resident population is concerned with the maintenance of their own social system, the university, it is little wonder that the graduate students receive special and sometimes almost affectionate attention from the residents.

The third migrant population, like the first one, is threatening to the residents—as a matter of fact, even more so. This third group is made up of adults who have established themselves in other social systems. They come seeking much more specific help than do the captive adolescents, who are established nowhere in particular. They insist on putting their own questions rather than depending on the resident to put the questions for them. The adults come in bearing the badges and symbols of other social systems. Sometimes they come from social systems that, in the larger community, have higher prestige than that of the university. It is hardly surprising that they should be something of a continuing threat to the resident population. Few of this group aspire to become residents in the university. They usually bring fairly clear concerns with them—concerns which are personal, civic, or organizational. They want to draw selectively upon university resources, not typically organized for such a purpose, in understanding and meeting these extra-university concerns.

Sometimes groups and organizations of these intruders will actually import more or less established members of the resident population into their own extra-mural meetings and conclaves. Here the threat of contamination and disloyalty to university standards is even greater than in adult work on the campus. The ritual defenses against contamination must be even stronger, if such a university person is successfully to resist temptation to disloyalty. Reading lists may be longer and examinations more difficult in extra-mural work for credit. The resident is tempted to over-insist on his university identification, sometimes to the point of non-communication.

To understand the resident population of the university, we must look more closely at its general preoccupation with achieving, extending, and maintaining accuracy and refinement of statements and symbolic formulations. In doing so, I should like to draw upon Francis Bacon's entomological categorization of seekers after knowledge. I shall make two changes in his classification: First, I shall add the wasp to his categories of bees, ants, and spiders. Second, I shall try to use the terms without his invidious devaluation of some of them. Bacon, convinced that his method, his novum organum, could solve all problems of knowledge, looked down upon the spiders and the ants, believing that the bees alone used and understood his "experimental" method. And, in his revolt against medieval scholasticism, Bacon was especially incensed against spider knowledge. I, on the contrary, see a functional part for each kind of knowledge-seeking within the broad processes of formulating warranted statements.

In the university, then, you will find ants. Here I refer to those practicing the arts of preservative and cumulative scholarship, the arts of the archivist and museum curator. They patiently assemble bits of knowledge and lore with no clear eye to what they are attempting to prove or disprove. Often as scholars collect painstaking descriptions of any number of things and place these together, they or others will see relationships and generalizations that could not otherwise have been seen. And some of these relationships, as they are formulated and tested further, become knowledge. So I think the ant functions of the university are very important, though the ants seldom win Nobel prizes for their work.

The wasp functions are critical functions, tendentious attacks upon false and pretentious claims to knowledge. Perhaps most often the university wasp stings other members of the resident population, particularly those from other universities. But the stinger may be directed against outsiders as well, including university administrators. The wasps make no honey, accumulate no descriptive bits, and spin no webs of theory. Yet their function is, I believe, important. It can be misdirected. Sometimes it mistakes the novel and the creative for the second and third rate. But, all in all, the wasps serve an important function in maintaining hygienic standards within the symbolic life of the university and sometimes of the larger society.

The spiders of the university are engaged in weaving speculations—creative, synthetic formulations. They draw heavily upon their inner resources of fantasy and symbolism and are sometimes lax in meeting public and "objective" standards of rigor in their work. They add to the meaning of what is known and what is not yet known, even though they may frequently formulate meanings which will never be known. According to my observations, the spiders have recently had a hard time in the university —in general, the posture of critic is more comfortable to maintain in university circles. Particularly in philosophy the wasps have sometimes driven the spiders underground. This leads to a functional imbalance, in my opinion (and here I may be close to a value judgment). I have noticed that the university is more and more assuming responsibility for the patronage of musical composers and other creative artists. This may help to bring the spider function back into repute within the university, in the sense of giving prestige to creative rather than only to critical work. But there is always the other possibility, that the arts, as their patronage shifts to the university, will tend to become more pedantic and less spidery than perhaps the arts should be.

The bee function is in a sense the research function, though "research" is sometimes applied to ant functions as well. The bees draw from the speculations of the spiders, warily avoid the pitfalls pointed out by the wasps, and abstract relationships from the descriptions accumulated by the ants. But the bee goes beyond these derivative functions and designs ways to put his generalizations to various public tests in action and experience. Out of the bee functions come statements which are perhaps most dependable for generalization within the university or from the university to the outside.

These, then, are the functions, all of them potentially important, within the knowledge-seeking processes of the university.

Who controls the social system of the university? As I have interviewed members of the migrant populations and the resident population with this question, nearly all of the migrants and some of the residents point to the front office. As one examines the front office, with its president and its network of vice-presidents, deans, deanlets, and directors, one finds some interesting differences within this population. There is a difference in language—much more rhetorical eloquence in extra-mural statements is allowed (or required) than in the statements of the regular resident population. Also one finds an emphasis in internal communications upon the language of cost accounting and management—even more, at times, than in the language of faculty members in departments of accounting and management.

The population of the front office seeks public contact and intercourse, where the tendency of the resident population is to minimize or avoid such contact and intercourse. In public statements, members of the front office tend to minimize differences between the social system of the university and other social systems in the society. An attempt is made to convince outsiders that the people in the university are much like everyone else—regular fellows, as it were. The only exception to this rule seems to be when the front office uses particularly recondite, scholarly achievements of some residents for purposes of mystification of the public. Here the awful differences between the university and the rest of the society may be emphasized.

An important part of these variations stems from the differences in functions of front-office personnel and those of persons on the academic faculty. The front office must deal with a lay board and with the segments of community interest which board members "represent." They must cultivate influential and affluent segments of the community in maintaining the economic position of the university. They must assure the general public that the university is morally and politically "sound" and "constructive." These functions are bound to modify the language they employ away from the academic norm.

I have noticed that the front office uses nearly all of the devices available to management in industrial organizations in attempts to control the resident population—budgetary reviews, cost-accounting procedures, salary threats and promises. But I also have noticed more ingenious ways of resisting arbitrary control by the front office on the part of the resident populations than I have ever observed in industrial and military organizations. These ways of resistance are in some cases institutionalized—as in norms of academic freedom—and in others ad hoc and informal.

Perhaps all this helps to explain the apparently contradictory results of my interviews with front-office people concerning the control of the university system. Here the modal answer is that they really do not know who runs the internal affairs of the university.

Another question which helps in our understanding of a social system is, what are its central and peripheral regions? Centrality in the university system can be measured in two related ways. First, where is the strongest motivation toward the maintenance of the social system and its purposes of symbolic hygiene? By both these standards, the central region of the university is in the departments of the college of arts and sciences and of the graduate school. The more peripheral regions of the university are occupied by the professional schools and those in extension activities of various kinds.

If you examine more closely the social organization of the departments of arts and sciences, you will find that the stronger reference groups of their members—the learned societies—are typically made up of other university people. Even their outside associations thus tend to bolster the maintenance of the university system. Members of these departments probably need the university to give them and their graduate students a social role and a job. A professor of Greek finds very little chance for employment outside a university. This condition generates not merely economic motivations to maintain the university system. Its maintenance is needed to perpetuate a social role which is for them a dedicated vocation.

Persons in the peripheral parts of the university are brought by the very nature of their studies and their work into contact with segments of the outside society. Schools of theology must deal with churches, schools of education with public schools, divisions of extension and evening colleges with all manner of men and institutions. They must respond somehow to the outside problems, concerns, demands, and pressures of the clientele which they are trying to educate. Typically, members of the periphery belong to reference groups which are made up of a majority of non-university, a minority of university, people. Most of them could find jobs elsewhere in case the university disappeared, and most of their students hold or are seeking jobs which are outside the university system.

It is not surprising that there is tension between the central and peripheral regions of the university. With the front office fluctuating in its identification between the central and peripheral parts of the university, tension often breaks into open conflict. This tension is an inescapable fact. In my judgment, from the standpoint of the health and productivity of the university, it is also a good thing. The art of university administration at its best is to use this tension and conflict creatively.

The virtue of the university center is to maintain precise, accurate, sufficiently qualified statements and generalizations about any number of things. The center maintains tentativeness with respect to matters of knowledge where tentativeness is needed and attacks with vigor knowledge claims which incorporate insufficient intellectual rigor. A university could not be a university without these virtues.

The periphery of the university has its virtues too. Typically, it is closer to the interests, the concerns, and the maintenance and growth requirements of other parts of the society than is the center. Members of the periphery cannot dispense with the category of social importance; they must use the categories of urgency and emergency in making their judgments about emphases in teaching and in research. In a sense they must bring the wider society to the university—they must mediate between this wider society and the center of the university.

The sins of the center, if there were only a center, have been described by A. N. Whitehead in his brilliant essay, "Harvard: the Future," published in 1936.[1] If there were only a center to the university—scholarship would tend to become trivial, unimportant, but, oh, so refined. In such a situation Byzantine learning takes over. Students are brought up with the notion, so far as the university is concerned, that rats occur only tame and in cages, never in barns or docks; that chemicals occur only in bottles on shelves in a chemically pure state, never in rocks and ores and smelters; that poets are to be found only on library shelves, never in garrets and bars and bohemias. The center needs the periphery to save the university from social and moral trivialization.

---

[1] Atlantic Monthly (September 1936), pp. 260-70.

The sins of the periphery, on the other hand, were the periphery to take over the university, are equally real. Under the pressure of practical urgency and emergency, the periphery would tend to replace logic with rhetoric, rigorously tested statements with wish fulfillments, critical caution with fulsome moral edification. There is a tendency for people who live at the periphery of the university to endorse ideas because they meet the "felt needs" of a profession or a public without submitting them to the intellectual and empirical testing which sound ideas require. The periphery needs the center to save the university from intellectual barbarization.

The art of creative university administration is to use the conflict and tension between the center and periphery so that the university can at once keep alive to categories of social importance and urgency and maintain standards of intellectual rigor, cultivate the hygiene of symbolism and communication, without which the intellectual life of the university becomes flabby, rhetorical without logic, normal rather than normative.

At this point I would like to change hats. Up to now I have written as a participant observer of university life. Now I am writing as one identified with adult education and its advancement. What wisdom can adult educators distill from my observation?

At no place in the university is the conflict and tension between center and periphery more evident than in its adult education activities. As noted earlier, adults are already established in other social systems outside the university. They come with specific concerns—personal, civic, organizational—and they want help from the university in meeting these demands. Every adult group or class is in part a venture in attempting to apply the knowledge, the methods, the spirit and approach of the knowledge-seekers to some problem of practical or moral concern. (At least this is so whenever the adult student has not regressed completely to adolescence.) It does not always seem that way to the instructor. He may be more aware of the "stubborn" resistances of adult students against accepting completely his way of putting the questions that are discussed and his judgments as to what it is important to know, as graduate students tend to do and as many undergraduate students do on the surface at least. He may question the taste and judgment of adult students in their insistence upon bringing into university discussions personal and practical problems which are "irrelevant" to its intellectual concerns.

The proper goal of adult classes is not to solve social or personal problems in terms of the university's resources of knowledge or method alone. This is actually an impossible goal—and, from my standpoint, fortunately so. Some university people may believe that this is the goal (as too enthusiastic students may also). If our ideas were just known to the public, some professors seem to believe, then the problems of society would be solved. I do not believe the process of applying knowledge is that simple.

The purpose of adult teaching in the university is not so much to solve the problems of adults in terms known and congenial to the university. It is rather to infuse into the deliberations and decisions of families and businesses and labor unions and churches, into the endless variety of personal and social situations where practical choices are being made, some of the intellectual functions of the knowledge-seeker—something of his standards of precise and refined statement, something of his urge to be accurate and intellectually responsible. This is no longer a luxury for American society. Increasingly this society has moved away from a situation in which customs and traditions are adequate controls and arbiters of choice and conduct; more and more Americans must depend upon conscious and planful deliberations to direct the course of their personal and collective lives. This is an important reason why the spirit, method, and approach of the university, as well as the tested meanings which it can furnish, are indispensable parts, but parts only, of practical judgments that fit the requirements of the time.

It is not hard to show how practical deliberations might be improved by incorporating into their processes the ant functions, wasp functions, spider functions, and bee functions which it is the function of the university to maintain and to cultivate in their "purity." Practical plans and projects almost always lack painstaking descriptions of situations, of planning processes, of actions based on the plans, and of the happenings which result. The planners do not have the material later to help them decide why their plans worked out, if they did, or why they failed, if they did. Ant functions built into practical planning might help. Practical actions and decisions are frequently taken on the basis of assumptions that have not been thoroughly criticized. Assumptions are used because they are popular or because they are morally edifying rather than because they are cognitively sound. Wasp functions in planning might help here. Frequently practical men make specific decisions without seeing how these fit in with other specific decisions they have made, are making, or will make. Vision is lacking, and inconsistencies and confusions between specific decisions multiply. Built-in spider functions might help to prevent these undesirable effects. Planners frequently fail to set up empirical tests of the soundness of their plans and hypotheses, even when such tests are possible. As a result they learn little from one experience that helps them do a better job with the next. Bee functions might help to maximize the learning of practical men from their experiences.

University resources might thus help nonacademic men in improving their plans and decisions, personal and collective. But can university people come to see that participation in adult education will help them also in advancing the central interests of the university? Unless this question can be answered affirmatively, university residents, particularly those from the center, will find little sustained and sustaining reason for participation in adult education work. True enough, the lure of extra pay does lead some to give time to adult work. The appeal of social service to their fellow men does similarly attract others. But these are peripheral appeals to university residents qua university people. They must come to see that their participation in adult education does advance their interests as university people, does promote the welfare of the university system, if they are to give themselves to adult work with a whole heart and mind.

There are, it seems to me, three reasons why there is a coincidence between the welfare of the social system of the university and participation of its residents in adult education work.

First, the adult group or class provides an opportunity to study and experiment with the application of knowledge to practical questions. As we have already noted, the adult is a migrant who comes to the university actually struggling with some problem or other of applying knowledge, whatever his fringe motivations may be. At heart, this is an intellectual problem—one of the most compelling intellectual problems of our time. We often try to over-simplify it by assuming that there is some little technique or trick which, if we use it in "getting the knowledge across," will lead to desirable changes in practice and conduct consistent with the knowledge. The problem is not that easy! The fact is that the situation of application is tremendously complicated by a multitude of interlacing factors. All kinds of established patterns and mores, all kinds of emotional sets and attitudes, all kinds of value systems, all kinds of roles and interrelationships must somehow be taken into account and altered, if the knowledge is to be applied—if desirable changes, consistent with the better knowledge, are to be accomplished.

I should like to see teachers of adults fired with enthusiasm by this challenging intellectual problem of applying knowledge and to see them, in turn, begin to fire their university colleagues with the same enthusiasm. Many university people have something to contribute to understanding the problem, if they put their minds and skills to it—social scientists, humanists, historians, philosophers, theologians, health students, as well as educators and journalists, social workers and engineers.

I would make one suggestion as to how this interest may be cultivated in university people. Frequently it is easier to see the problem of application clearly when you are consulting with some group, organization, or community in planning a whole adult education program than when you are dealing with individual adults in a classroom. People from the center of the university, when they are enlisted as consultants to organizations, can sometimes see the problems of applying knowledge written large in all of its difficulty, complexity, and fascination. Later they can come to see the same problem exemplified in the small by adult students in their classrooms.

Second, the adult student can provide the professor with insights regarding gaps in existing knowledge, places where the university does not now have available and relevant knowledge. If alert adults are permitted to ask relevant questions which the teacher cannot answer in terms of his own discipline, at the least it may drive him to a greater respect for other disciplines. At the most, it may stimulate him to new studies in his own field or to an interdisciplinary approach to these questions. Perhaps the people at the center could be persuaded to let adults question them and probe the limits of their knowledge and their disciplines, in spite of the threat involved, if it could be demonstrated that here is a resource in opening gaps in existing knowledge in those disciplines and deficiencies in communication among the disciplines and departments of the university.

Third, one of the best ways of becoming a better teacher is to go through the process of trying to teach adults effectively. This point requires little amplification. The problem is to convince those at the center of the university that participation in adult work provides a way for them to become better teachers of their graduate students. It may help in teaching undergraduates more effectively, too, but for many residents this is not so important a consideration.

In conclusion, I would like to repeat one conviction on which I have operated throughout. The art of creative university administration, it seems to me, is not to try to smooth over, to erase, conflict and tension between the center and the periphery of the university, but to try to channel it into some sort of collaborative activity. The stakes are high, both socially and intellectually. The aim is that our society may become more intellectually responsible and that the university, without losing its intellectual responsibility, may become more socially responsive and relevant as well. This is not only a major task of general university administration. It is most particularly the opportunity and task of university administrators in adult education as well.

THE PHILOSOPHICAL BASIS OF ADULT EDUCATION

J. McLeish

J. McLeish is a Lecturer in the Department of Adult Education and Extra-Mural Studies at the University of Leeds, England.

Part Two: The Method of Adult Education

There are certain dangers inherent in the study of method in education, for in the past such study has often resulted in the discovery of what was considered to be the one sovereign method appropriate to all subjects of instruction and all circumstances—for example, Comenius, the Herbartians, and so on. We must beware of dogmatism in this field, since the consideration of the general principles of method in the abstract often has a crippling effect on the originality and enterprise of the educator; his primary role as teacher is lost in the emphasis on his role as technician. If, therefore, we seek to elaborate the general or common principles in the various academic studies appropriate to adult education in a liberal society, this is not with the view of developing a decalogue to be graven on tablets of stone, but rather with the idea of suggesting the proper limits which must bound the freedom of the individual teacher—thus by implication defining the area of liberty of improvisation— if he is to be considered as providing instruction which properly falls within the tradition of university teaching, and within the historical tradition of English, liberal, adult education.

The starting-point of such an investigation is determined by three considerations: the nature of the adult, especially in his character as an actual or potential student; the qualities appropriate to the teacher or tutor of such an educand; and lastly, the nature of knowledge, especially as seen through the medium of the various, specialized disciplines.

With regard to the adult: we can assume, since he is an adult, that

---

Reprinted from University of Leeds Institute of Education, Researches and Studies, No. 12 (1955).

he has passed through the experiences of childhood and adolescence and has made a socially acceptable and adequate adjustment to the demands imposed in these two stages of life. We can assume also that he reaches us after having received and profited from a certain minimum education, such that he is literate, and has sufficient intelligence and savoir-faire to appreciate the nature of his educational and social problems, and to discuss these in a coherent and relatively informed fashion. This is the minimum that we can, and must, demand as far as the nature of the student is concerned. Since the average level of discourse of the average University tutor might be expected to be that of the middle page of the Manchester Guardian, the ability to understand an average middle page article (with a week's grace to digest it) might be taken as the objective measure of the minimum level of attainment of a potential student.[1]

Thus the nature of the student points to the starting-point of the process of education in adult classes, insofar as all students are presumed to have a common background of experience of growing up in a democratic community—however imperfect this community may be when democratic practices are contrasted with democratic principles—and to have a certain modicum of the quality described as "common sense." This gives us the first common principle of method in all adult classes, namely, that the method of common sense is brought to bear on the experience of the student (and of the tutor) by reasoned discussion between them.

What is the minimum we can demand of the tutor? The most obvious quality, and perhaps the most important in the long run, is his position as the representative of an organised body of knowledge summed up in the organisation of a university. The tutor is presumed, being an educator, to have himself received a specialised training of an academic character so that he exhibits the characteristic described in the phrase, "a trained mind." In addition, because the two are by no means synonymous, if he is to be a successful adult educator, he must have the further quality of "common sense" (to be discussed at a later stage). In the setting of the adult class, this quality is initially manifested in his interest in, and possession of a method for dealing with, "problems," as contrasted to "academic questions." He should exhibit in his approach to the contemporary problems of "real life" those virtues which are presumed to characterise a university—namely, discrimination, objectivity, and generosity to those whose opinions, beliefs and methods differ from his own. The quality of universality, in the sense that it takes all knowledge to be its province, apportioning out the various departments of human knowledge to its specialist scholars, is supposed to be the characteristic of the ideal university: hence the name. So the educator should possess, perhaps in an unformulated way, but best of all consciously and daily informing his teaching, "an accurate anatomy of the universe, dissecting the veins and limbs of the universe" (Comenius). Thus the second common principle of method in all adult classes is an attitude to experience at once analytical, objective and tolerant.

---

[1] This criterion is quoted, under protest, to meet the demand for a more objective statement than the verbal description immediately above. It should be stressed that this is a personal opinion.

On the side of the subject [illegible] study of the particular class: this finds its place in the ordered and organised body of knowledge, a place which is defined implicitly by its place in university studies, and more formally in terms of academic ordinance and senatorial committee. The scope and limits of the particular subject being defined in this way, the rationale of such procedures in the apportionment of the segments of human knowledge, should be the concern of the educator and his students. As methodology is a common concern of the specialised academic disciplines—even though such common concern may rarely reach the surface of consciousness in a formal way, since conflicts over jurisdiction are normally resolved by informal, day-to-day peripheral skirmishes, in an atmosphere of friendship and devotion to common purposes—so within each particular field of academic study the adult class should be conscious of the problems of methodology. Therefore the third common principle of method in all adult classes is a concern for methodology, a concern which must inevitably be verbalised and critically aware of itself in a continual definition of the frontiers, the methodological assumptions, of the particular, specialised discipline being studied.

If we look at the subject from the inside rather than from the outside as we have so far been doing, our prescriptions become more specific and probably more vulnerable to criticism. It is implied above that the core of the curriculum in the field of adult studies is the central questions of social living, questions that are contemporary, but at the same time universal in the sense that they have been the common concern of mankind at least as far back as written history will take us. In an important sense, every adult class, no matter how it may be described in the syllabus, is concerned with the self-same questions of truth and justice, of freedom and authority, of tradition and innovation, of life and immortality. This is the common core, but it is not, of course, the whole sum and substance of adult education, being merely its most significant, valuable and interesting part. If adult education has any social purpose, surely it consists in making students and tutors critically aware of the society in which they are living, critically aware of tradition, and of what may be said pro and contra the various strands which go to make up contemporary society—the liberal, the Christian, the conservative, the radical and other elements and motives of English civilization. This is the fourth common principle of method in all adult classes: that all authority, whether of the tutor, of society, of religion, of tradition, of knowledge itself, is suspect until it has submitted its credentials to disciplined, rational, critical analysis. This does not imply a rejection of authority as such, but merely states that the conditions logically precedent to the acceptance of guidance shall be established after rational examination. This may be done incidentally and by implication—although if it is considered a major aim of adult education, as the present writer considers it to be, at some stage the problem must be approached directly and not obliquely.

What should be the final result, the end, which the educator must clearly visualise and attempt to work towards at all times? This surely is the uncovering and fostering of what he considers to be desirable qualities in the educand.

The great educators, whether in the theoretical or the practical sphere, have always prejudged the issues posed by Aristotle, the question whether knowledge, instruction, is for virtue or for use. In the field of adult education this issue is also prejudged, insofar as adult education must be liberal and not vocational. Adult education is therefore for virtue and not for use, except insofar as use fosters virtue. Those virtues which adult education seeks to foster are limited in number, since adult education has merely a limited jurisdiction, but they are no less compelling as desirable ends of the learning process in this context.

What are these ends? Perhaps the most urgent is that the commitments of each student should be subjected by him to a rational scrutiny, to determine exactly what he is committed to, and what its rational status is, in reality. The aim of adult education is not to convert anyone to anything, or away from anything, but merely to provide the context of reasoned discussion which will permit of each student, and tutor, examining the content and basis of his conviction. It is implicit in the provision of such opportunities by the various providing bodies that such discussion shall serve the purposes of a democratic society, in that it can proceed only in an atmosphere of toleration. A good adult class will quicken the imagination and lead to that insight into the rights and duties of responsible citizenship which is the essence of democratic institutions, since the good class is itself a democratic society in microcosm. Students and tutors learn the need for toleration—toleration based not on the "couldn't care less" attitude, but on a sympathetic awareness of opposed viewpoints, and of responsibility which, while recognising differences, can reach common agreed decisions. The fifth common principle of method in all adult classes consists, therefore, in the deliberate attempt to teach in such a way that there will be a transfer from the subject and the class situation to real life, in a manner which accords with the virtues characteristic of an ideal democracy.

Inherent in the idea of democracy is the associated concept of equality. This is reflected in the adult class in the recognition of a contribution to make to the work of the class, not only in the everyday discussion, but in the final result. The nature of these respective contributions, of the tutor on the one hand and of the student on the other, are different in quality, but it is impossible to generalise as to the relative importance of each, just as one cannot generalise as to whether the husband or the wife is the more important factor in a happy marriage. Each is complementary to the other. This idea of fellowship in education, "the union of scholarship and labour," which is the basic, founding principle of adult education first elaborated by F. D. Maurice, clearly separates liberal adult education from all other varieties—whether it be the further education provided by Local Education Authorities, the education of children, or the university training given to adolescents. This is the sixth common principle of method in all adult classes, namely, the idea of a fellowship between the educator and the group of educands, of such character that the organisation of the class permits and encourages the students to make a contribution to the discussions and to the final result, different in quality from that of the tutor, but complementary to it. Education as "a common, on which all men can exercise rights" (Mansbridge) with no distinction of rank, is not a mere sop thrown to students to make them docile instruments of the tutor's will, a subtle method of dominating intellectual inferiors, but is a real democratic principle breathing life into the whole system of organised classes, making of it a movement instead of merely an idiosyncratic method of educational provision.

It would seem from the foregoing discussion of the common principles of method that the specialised subjects of study are swallowed up into one homogeneous mass, labelled "analysis of experience." This would be a highly undesirable consummation—assuming that it could ever be brought to a conclusion—for it would violate the proper autonoies that exist within the general field of knowledge, as well as violating the individualities of the exponents of the various academic studies. There is a particular method and content appropriate to each branch of knowledge—poetry is not the same as pushpin, even if we assume them to be of equal value.

How then can we safeguard the proper rights and responsibilities of the specialised academic subjects? The principle has been stated by Herbart: the correct selection of the material, and its correct presentation lead to the true end of education, that is, virtue. It is in the selection and the manner of presentation that the specific claims of the subject become apparent. This does not mean that we are committed to the textbook presentation, or even to the normal academic divisions supposed to be "natural" boundaries inherent in the tradition of knowledge. On the contrary, instruction, which means selection and presentation of the material, must arise out of the needs of the students, not, however, their needs as they conceive them to be, with the educator performing the purely passive role of middleman, but their actual needs conceived in relation to the implicit demands of the subject. We must avoid the excesses of the project method. But unless our educational efforts are inspired by the principle that education is first of all, and above all else, a participation, and only secondly or thirdly an anticipation or recapitulation, our students, who are in the first place voluntary students, will simply fade away. It is the function of the educator to resolve the tensions between the student and the curriculum, between "academic questions" and "real questions," between the logical and the psychological order of presentation, between true scholarship and "dry-as-dust" pedagogics. The curriculum, that is, the subject and its various divisions and sub-divisions, represents traditional problems and the solutions elaborated over the centuries. These come to us no longer with the living actuality of present experience, but in the desiccated, premasticated pabulum of the textbook, representing the regurgitations of generations of scholars and pedants. We cannot entirely sidestep the demands imposed by this tradition, but the curriculum must continually undergo modification in the present. Even the dullest textbook was at one time a living organism of culture to at least one person: there is no absolute opposition between the demands of the tradition of scholarship and current needs. This is shown by the successful attempts at mediation, when the subject of instruction is made to come alive through the personality of the teacher. This gives us the seventh common principle of method in all adult classes, as in general education, namely, that the subject of instruction must be adapted to the present needs of the student, but that it should not be so modified as to abandon traditional knowledge or its organisation (unless these can be shown clearly to be wrong in principle). The most successful method will be that in which there is a reconciliation, organically achieved, and not a mere compromise, between the logical and comprehensive treatment characteristic of the textbook and the actual centers of interest ("problems") of the student.

The difficulties facing a university teacher in adult education who attempts such modification or adaptation of the content of instruction are not so great as those which would face a similar teacher attempting to meet the interests of his internal students. The pressure to conformity mediated through the system of university examinations is absent. As a result there are tremendous opportunities for experimentation. Of course, the sentimental interest, associated with the fact that a particular method of teaching a given subject and a particular content of instruction were used when the educator was himself being educated, still operates, in addition to the vested interest of the teacher who only teaches what he can teach. But to counter these retrogressive features there is the fact that—however vaguely expressed and however contradictory it may be—the demand made by the adult student is a demand not only for a completed structure of knowledge (the demand for the subject) but also for a living structure of knowledge (the demand for the solution to life's problems). For this reason adult education is, potentially at least if not actually, a growing-point, or rather forcing-ground for the advancement of human knowledge.

The problem is to dissolve the logical order of the textbook, or subject approach, while maintaining the whole content of knowledge of the particular subject, and to reorganise the material around the major centers of human interest. One solution to this dilemma is the so-called "synoptic course"—but there are different kinds of synoptic courses, and not all of them serve this purpose. For example, there is the synoptic course in which the tutor attempts on separate occasions—for example, at yearly intervals—to disguise himself as, say, an economist, a historian, a literary critic, etc. The assumption of these disguises rarely deceives anyone, except those who are willing to be deceived. It is doubtful whether the assumption of omnicompetence implicit in this method is one appropriate to a university teacher. The main object of such a course, namely, the achievement of some kind of all-round synthesis, would not normally be achieved, unless with a teacher of unusual competence, and with students of unusual ability.

The other kind of synoptic course—and it is suggested that all adult classes should normally be synoptic courses of this kind—is one which attempts to achieve the desired synthesis by a different method. The tutor takes up a particular problem, not a textbook problem in the sense that its boundaries are sharply defined by the particular method and results previously obtained as are those of the standard textbook problems. Rather it should be a problem which confronts everyone in the contemporary world, for example, the question why the world is divided into two warring factions. The synthetic view, or the synoptic view, is obtained by subjecting this question to the methods appropriate to one particular discipline—for example, it might be psychology—but at the same time criticizing its methods in the actual historical, economic, political, philosophical, "commonsensical" context; eliciting its methodological presuppositions, *its exclusiveness*, etc., vis-vis these other academic studies, its particular expertise, its degrees of certainty, the compelling character of its testimony, and so on. In this way, provided the problem selected has that multiply-determined and comprehensive scope necessary for such a design, the student completes the course with that critical attitude to experience which it is the purpose of the course to inculcate, together with a conspectus of a particular subject. This yields us up the eighth common principle of method in all adult classes, that the method of conducting the course should provide at once a conspectus of the subject, and at the same time should indicate the various vantagegrounds from which the subject of the instruction itself may profitably be criticised. The critical attitude to experience can best begin with the actual tools of analysis provided by the different specialised subjects and with a criticism of their methods.

Thus it is an important function of the adult educator to provide "an accurate anatomy of the universe, dissecting the veins and limbs of the universe" (Comenius). Education belongs to the class of "human activities," but it differs from other human activities in important respects. For example, it is reflective. It sums up in its actual operative moment the three aspects of experience—past, present and future. It looks to the present insofar as the educand is actually engaged in present experience; it looks to the past insofar as it is in process of transmitting the hardly earned and hardly analysed experience of the race; it looks to the future insofar as it attempts to prepare the educand for future, foreseeable (and in some degree also unforeseeable) contingencies. It is, or should be, disciplined and logical. It represents a deliberate, self-conscious process of modification of the educand according to some preconceived, even if inadequately analysed and badly expressed, notion. It is mediated partly through persons and partly through a discipline of study of organised academic materials. We must now turn our attention to the last of these, namely, that knowledge is an organic body and not a series of disconnected things, and ask the question: How shall experience be analysed;

This question: How shall experience be analysed? is answered in large part when we have discussed the related question: How has experience been analysed in the past, and how is it analysed in the present?

We have already made the distinction between "common sense" and expertise, and suggested that these qualities respectively characterise the contributions made by the adult student and the adult tutor. How are these qualities differentiated in practice? The contributions made by students are characterised by a regard for the "wholeness" of experience, whereas those of the expert are possible only by a fragmentation of this wholeness. The common sense approach is characterised by an unsophisticated relationship between the subject and the object of inquiry, in which there is no consciousness of the necessity of distinguishing between the two; the approach of the expert is critical of his own perceptual mechanism and abstracts his own mental processes from the object of awareness. The common sense approach makes up in comprehensiveness what it lacks in precision; the expert has a narrow range but in compensation has a depth of analysis which common sense cannot attempt to equal. Common sense is lacking in self-awareness of the logical and empirical boundaries between "subjects"; it knows nothing about probability and the degrees of certainty or uncertainty of the expert. Common sense lacks a knowledge of the rules of evidence appropriate to academic studies; it often lacks a sense of relevance; it always lacks a special technique, and is frequently enmeshed in contradictions without being aware of these contradictions. The expert always knows where the line has to be drawn; he takes probability as the guide of life; he is judicial and in matters within his expert competence is dehumanised; he has a specialised method, and never contradicts himself except on the infrequent occasions when he ventures beyond the boundaries of his specialism; he has a special language, or jargon, by which he communicates with those who have studied his special subject and by which he marks himself off from other men. But he has a limited jurisdiction and can never make decisions of any moment for other men since, qua expert, he is not a human being; he is one-sided, and systematically so; he is the creature of a method—metaphorically a mere eye, or nose, or ear, singling out from the bustling confusion of reality some tiny fragment of experience, "with his rags and tatters attempting to stop up the breaches in the universe" (Heine).[2]

It is clear that the man of common sense and the expert share the quality in common that they have the defect of their virtues and that, potentially, they complement each other. This is the essential quality of an adult class and explains why universities have a vested interest in maintaining such classes. The expert is brought into intimate and continuous contact with common sense and in the process—assuming he takes his responsibilities seriously—is brought to question the foundations of knowledge itself as well as the narrower presuppositions of his specialised method and the results obtained by its application. Ultimately, the procedures of the expert must be justified by common sense, since this is the most basic category of experience, being the common-ground on which the expert meets not only the man-in-the-class but the other members of the community of scholars. In the latter case, however, the common-ground has undergone a continual shrinking as the specialised disciplines have successively pegged-out their claims on the ground of experience; as a consequence we have a dispersion of the organic body of knowledge to the four corners, with no one having the responsibility or the concern for its reintegration. It is in the field of education in general, and adult education in particular, that the concern for reintegration of the wholeness of experience, and the possibility of a method for such reintegration being discovered, is to be found, since it is here that the problems presented by specialisation become most urgent. The task is to return to common sense, but common sense on a higher level, with a knowledge of the scope and content of each of the academic studies, with a knowledge of the limits of expert knowledge, with a knowledge of the potentialities and weaknesses of the human spirit, with a knowledge of, and a responsible attitude towards, social problems and the difficulty of maintaining a due balance between justice and freedom. In other words, the task and aim of adult education is the development of all those qualities which are designated as belonging to wisdom.

---

[2] This analytical contrast of common sense and expertise is drawn almost totally from discussions with Walter Stein. These descriptions are to be conceived as analytical models; the distinction between "common sense" and expertise is not an absolute one.

This is the ninth common principle of method in all adult classes, namely, the recognition that true wisdom is to be obtained by listening to the voice of experience which comes to all of us through the distorting prism of our limited experience of life, our specialised upbringing and training, our peculiar beliefs and opinions, and which can only be heard in something approaching its original form by piecing together these distorted echoes, striking out the obviously idiosyncratic interpretation and seeking the universal in each particular report. It is here that the tutor has most to contribute in the form of criteria of relevance, the logical organisation of the material elicited, the tests of comprehensiveness and coherence which he knows how to apply. But the material he works by means of his technique, and the judgment of adequacy or inadequacy of the finished product, come in great measure from the students, in the ideal case. Our own experience is what we can be most sure of, but this experience must be subjected to critical analysis before we can accept its compulsions as truths. The method of analysis must be worked out anew with each different class, as tutor and students grow in wisdom.

In addition to a common attitude characteristic of the academic approach, every adult class would appear from this analysis to have a common framework of content implicitly running through the syllabus, determining, or at least conditioning, the choice of problem for discussion, the appropriate manner of discussing it, and so on. This content is usually dealt with in an incidental fashion, although on occasion it may be made the formal subject of discussion. It arises partly as the result of student pressure, although it is inherent in the nature of the relationship of the tutor to his students and of both to society. It becomes central because of the character of the human intellect, its quest for certainty, its refusal to rest on any self-constituted authority for an indefinite period, its uncontrollable desire for absolute knowledge.

What, then, is this common content? The conflict of opinion, which is the life of the adult class, resolves itself logically and historically into conflict about the nature of man and the universe. The adult class may never arrive at this ultimate level in their discussion, in which case it might be argued that this class has not been successful as a university class, it being characteristic of university education that, at some stage, it raises these ultimate questions. But all discussions are, in a sense, peripheral to this main discussion. The tutor or students may limit their discussion to the most superficial level of discourse, that is, the subject; they may go deeper, that is, to social implications; but if they do not traverse these levels to reach the third level, that is, a scrutiny of beliefs about the nature of man himself, it is doubtful if these students have really obtained all that a university education should offer.

We have already disclaimed all intention of converting students to anything or away from anything, so far as an organised system of beliefs is concerned. But each tutor is committed by the conditions and pre-scholarship. However, this tradition (at least in the ideal case) sets no limits to the beliefs or opinions that the scholar may hold or seek to foster. "There is no opinion so silly or so immoral, but that it has been held by some philosopher" we are told. We must claim this right to hold silly or immoral opinions (as these are regarded by the majority) not only for our students but for ourselves. We must only demand consistency: for example, if they advocate suicide as a solution to man's problems, they must have sufficient sense of responsibility to go away and dispose of themselves in a decent manner. There is an unwritten contract between society, tutor and student which demands responsibility, consistency, a disinterested pursuit of truth, and in return grants freedom from all arbitrary authority, the right to dissent from received opinions, liberty of action within the law, the right to attempt to change accepted valuations if these are not in accordance with right reason. There is a collateral demand in the granting of such rights and assigning of such duties that we should examine the nature of belief itself, to determine the character of evidence, whether adequate or inadequate, by which beliefs are normally arrived at, to criticise and examine the presuppositions of particular beliefs, the human needs which these satisfy, and so on. In particular, the criteria by means of which a reasoned and reasonable choice may be made between specific beliefs must be discussed, in one form or another, so that students may make responsible decisions in their capacity as citizens. This discussion, as has previously been suggested, may take place on the most superficial level, but university adult classes have now themselves an established tradition which suggests that as time passes the discussion passes from this superficial level of ordinary, conversational exchanges of opinion, to the ultimate level of reasoned analysis of the basis of rational conviction.

At this ultimate level, it has been suggested that the tests which must be applied are those of coherence and comprehensiveness, the pragmatic test, the test of social relevance, the test as to whether a given system provides a reasonable and acceptable theory of ethics and aesthetics, and so on. On the basis of the standpoint developed above, it would appear that these criteria in relation to particular viewpoints must be discussed, formally or informally, explicitly or implicitly, whether the class is "about" economics, or psychology or philosophy.

Thus the student, and the tutor, is compelled to confront his own basic presuppositions, to define his ultimate convictions which no kind of empirical discourse can possibly overturn, to apportion the relative degrees of certainty and uncertainty associated with each. This is the tenth common principle of method in all adult classes, namely, that each class presents an opportunity for the student to examine his ultimate commitment, to decide what are the enduring elements in his beliefs and opinions, so that when the occasion demands it he may make a reasoned choice on the basis of actual conviction, and not be swayed by accidental circumstances or momentary irrational considerations. It is only in terms such as these that adult education can ultimately justify its right to existence and subsidies from society—that it leads, or should lead, to an informed and responsible body of citizens, knowing their true interests, able to lead when the situation demands leadership, able to find reasoned arguments for their actions if called upon to do so, adaptable, but knowing where adaptability becomes weakness and cowardice.

Adult education would seek to justify itself to the university by pointing to those ends which are co-extensive with the ends of university education, but in addition would point to the potential contribution which this movement can make and has made in the past to the advancement of knowledge. "We do not come as suppliants," said the working man J. M. MacTavish, addressing the University of Oxford in 1907, "but claim education as a right, wrongfully withheld. Work-people," he continued, "could do far more for Oxford than Oxford can do for the work-people."

Of the influence of knowledge on the individual character we need not speak, since this is an end clearly recognised in all education everywhere. Similarly, the pleasure of the individual in knowledge as an end in itself is considered to be outside the particular frame of reference of this discussion. Each raises considerations relevant to education, but it is perhaps sufficient thus to pay tribute to their existence and importance.

THE METHOD OF ADULT EDUCATION

Herbert P. Schueler

Herbert P. Schueler, Director of Teacher Education at Hunter College, New York City, came to that position from six years as Director of the School of General Studies at Queens College, Flushing, Long Island, New York.

I

In all education, method needs to be appropriate to the situation in which it is employed, and to the purpose which it attempts to realize. Transfer of the same method from one situation to another, especially if differing purposes are involved, is fraught with danger to effective learning. Like successive carbon copies, the effectiveness decreases with distance from the original.

Adult education is most vulnerable in this respect. As an offspring of institutionalized elementary, secondary, and higher education, it has tended to retain the characteristics of its parents, but in no other respect as markedly as in method. This is in spite of the fact that the situation and purpose of adult education—as embodied in the aspirations, status, abilities, and occasions for learning of its clientele—is in many ways quite different from the situation and purpuose of full-time education of children, adolescents, and young adults.

In the years of development from childhood, to adolescence, to manhood, the school and the task of being a student is expected to be the dominant factor in a person's life. To learn is supposed to be his vocation. He is expected to devote his best time and his freshest energy to this primary task, much as the businessman devotes himself to his business, the physician to his practice, the artisan to his craft. Institutionally directed self-improvement is his primary job. His life is expected to be school-centered, the better to prepare him for future responsibilities beyond the school.

Reprinted from Adult Leadership, V, No. 10 (April 1957).

As a result, the dominant stimuli directing the school are derived from forces outside the primary environment of the learner. The world of the adult, even in a so-called child-centered school environment, determines the goal and directs the learning of the child, the adolescent, the young adult.

From the learner, rather than consciousness of being, the school exacts continuing preoccupation with becoming. Impermanence, continuing transition, development directed from without by adult mentors acting on behalf of an adult world of which he is not yet a conscious nor recognized part, is characteristic of the school life of the young learner.

Motivations in such schooling tend to be largely imposed upon the student. Class attendance is compulsory; assignments are obligatory; curricular patterns are prescribed. Even though the learner may be encouraged to follow his own interests, he can do so only within institutionalized prescriptions. Should his attention wander, his interest in learning wane, the school can be counted on to exert its pressure. Grades, credits, assignments, examinations, report cards, permanent records, diplomas, degrees are cogs in this prescriptive machinery. The learning atmosphere tends to be competitive; individual excellence is extolled; earning a place on the honor roll, graduating with honors are virtues highly prized.

Co-operative enterprise, though bravely pressed by social-minded proponents of the virtues of group work, is generally overshadowed by these entrenched patterns of competitive learning stimuli. The teacher is the embodiment of the authority of the institution. Not only by virtue of training, maturity, and experience, does he exercise this authority, but by virtue of power over the student granted by the institution.

He may prescribe conduct, set tasks, and determine standards of performance. He is required to report periodically on the quality and extent of each student's development. In the guidance of his students' development, he may reward and he may punish. While his authority over the individuals in his charge has narrower limits, in essence his role is akin to the parental.

And while he may have students in his class who are essentially more intelligent, potentially wiser, and at some future date will hold life positions more powerful, more lucrative, or of a higher status than his own, at the present they are his inferiors, simply by being not yet adult. As viewed by the school and society, they not only know less, can do less, have fewer experiences, but they are less because they have not yet "grown up." Officially, in the eyes of their elders and in their own eyes, they are yet incomplete as human beings.

Adults Have a Different Drive

If these are elements of the learning situation characteristic of children and youth, their converse is true of adult education. The continuing education sought by an adult is a part-time, after-hours avocation, using time and energy spared from the primary demands of profession, family, and citizenship. His life is not, as with the young, school-centered; the school is for him life-centered. His goal is not preparation for a future life of which he is not yet a part, but the enrichment and enlargement of the scope and meaning of the life that he is now living.

As a result, the dominant stimuli directing the learning activities of the adult lie within his primary environment. As a part of the adult world, he expects to share in determining the goal and directing the learning, not of his children, but of himself. He seeks to become better what he now is, and not necessarily to strive toward what he is not yet. His motivations arise from the present and from within, rather than from the future and from without.

The institutionalized prescriptions characteristic of youth-education are not only uncalled for, they are useless if applied. Being self-motivated in seeking further education, the adult will expect to follow his own interests, and will follow the leadership of teacher and course only if he can be made to feel that this leadership is along the lines of his own interest. Should his attention wander, his interest wane, he will simply drop out, and any attempt to apply the pressure of conventional school prescriptions will not only fail, but will constitute an insult to his status as an adult.

In coming to class, the adult tends to be as interested in his fellow students as he is in the subject of the hour. Being less pressed by the competitive imperative to excel that characterized so much of the education of his youth, he is more socially oriented. For him, learning is most naturally a co-operative neighborly enterprise, and not the least of its attractions in the adult classroom is the opportunity it affords to work with others and extend his circle of acquaintances.

The Teacher of Adults Is Unique

The teacher in the adult class has few of the claims to authority that are his in a class of youth. He is one among equals. Neither age, social status, or institutional authority sets him above his students. His status as a leader has to be earned solely on his merits, through wisdom, knowledge, and teaching ability. What will gain the teacher acceptance is the realization among his students that, at least within the scope of the subject that he teaches, he knows more than his students and is able to communicate his knowledge, so that each student is conscious of his own growth.

The teacher of adults is truly on his mettle, for he works with his own kind, who are quick to detect his fitness to be their teacher. He is in an exposed position, unprotected by the status that is due the teacher of the young by virtue of just being an adult and the embodiment of an institution with disciplinary authority over the young. In fact, there is strong likelihood that the teacher of adults will have in his classes some students who are older than he is, some who occupy positions in the community of greater prestige than his own, some who earn more at their profession than he does, and even some who have enjoyed more formal schooling than he has.

What induces the physician, the owner of a business, the housewife with grown children, and the officer of the local Rotary Club to follow willingly the instructional lead of the young teacher of art, is that he inspires their confidence in his knowledge of the subject and in his ability to communicate some of this knowledge to them. His influence is restricted largely to his field of expertness, for in the area of medicine it is the physican who could be his teacher, as could the businessman in merchandising, the housewife in home management, the Rotarian in civic affairs.

There are many other differences between the class of 16 year-olds, let us say, studying art appreciation in the regular high school curriculum, and the class of adults studying modern art in the Adult Center.

The adolescents will all be within a year of each other's ages; the adults may range from the twenties to the sixties and beyond. The adolescents will have had the same amount and largely the same kind of schooling, and will have had it continuously up to and including the time they are in this given class; the adults will have had varying amounts and kinds of schooling, and will have had it at varying intervals before their present class.

The adolescents, especially if theirs is a required course in art appreciation, will vary in their initial interest in art. The adults are likely to be motivated by a much more common interest, or they wouldn't be in class in the first place.

The foregoing has been an attempt to show essential differences between the learning situation in elementary, secondary, and full-time higher education, and the educational niveau of the adult, as a way of demonstrating the fallacy of automatically transferring teaching method from one to the other. To be sure, there are some similarities and there is some truth —though not as much as is wishfully supposed—to the principle that good teaching is good teaching anywhere, and that the good teacher of children is likely to be a good teacher of adults.

The likelihood is overwhelmingly strong, however, that this good teacher of children is effective as a teacher of adults, because he recognizes that all good teaching emerges from the teacher's ability to channel productively the interests, capacities, needs, and aspirations of his students. The principle that good teaching is good teaching anywhere, then, has a built-in set of diversities—the students; and in the case of the good elementary school teacher who also is successful as a teacher of adults, it is his ability to adapt to the requirements of each group that has made him successful with both of them.

Know Your Students

What, then, are some of the elements of appropriate method for adult education? At no level of education is the adage, "Know your students," more crucial. One can quickly tell whether a teacher of adults is likely to be effective by listening to his response to the question, "How did your first class go?"

Suppose the teacher of the course in modern art says, "As an introduction to the course I attempted to give some idea of what is meant by 'modern' when we talk of modern art, mainly to dispel the notion that all painting done in our times can be classed as modern. To illustrate my point, I showed them some reproductions of contemporary representational art and contrasted them with examples of Picasso, etc. etc."

The chances are that if he continues in that vein, the class will fall short of reasonable expectations. Suppose, however, he begins by saying to his students, "I discovered during our first meeting that quite a few of you are active Sunday painters. Two are physicians who have exhibited in Medical Society art shows; one is a compositor in a printing firm who has a good background in the graphic arts but finds it difficult to understand 'what modern artists are trying to say.' In addition, several showed themselves to be familiar with the Museum of Modern Art and some of the private art galleries, and one housewife has made a hobby of collecting books of art reproductions. Three confessed they have had little contact with art in any form, but would just like to know more about it . . . ."

This teacher is well on the way to leading an effective and rewarding course. He has realized that he needs first of all to become familiar with the background of his students, at least as it relates to the course. This lets him get some idea of what they are likely already to know, what their present attitudes toward modern art are, what part art has played in their lives. With this knowledge he can be guided in the selection of subject matter, and in the selection of class and out-of-class activities. He can make sure that he is not repeating things they already know and can judge what goals are attainable with this particular class.

He needs to discover the extent of heterogeneity in the background of his students, so that he can find common grounds that will apply to all and make provision for individual diversification of activities in the case of obvious deviants.

There are very few members of adult groups who cannot offer some valuable resource to the class. The housewife may be induced to share her collection of reproductions with her fellow-students. The compositor may contribute insight into the trends in design as embodied in various typefaces. The Sunday painters may help others to see limitations and possibilities of different kinds of painting media. As living exemplars of persons who have produced an art form, however tentative and amateurish, they can help make vivid to others the problems, rewards, and agonies of attempts at artistic creation. The art gallery habitues, by recounting their experiences, may kindle interest in informal art gallery visits by members of the class.

The good teacher of adults will go further. Realizing the importance of active student involvement—instead of passive spectatorship—he will invite student help in planning the activities of the course in kind, scope and sequence.

At the very least, the students should feel that the plan and the evolving activities are acceptable to them; ideally, they should have an active part in the planning process. The more the students feel that the course is theirs, however much or little of instructor leadership is found to be necessary, the more likely it is that they will find learning satisfaction.

The discovery and proper channeling of the students' ability to share in the planning of an adult course is probably the most difficult instructional problem the teacher of adults has to face. His is still the responsibility of leadership. He must be within the process at all times, gauging the extent and kind of his own direction as the activities develop, perhaps taking over completely at times, effacing himself deliberately at others. But at all times he must have the confidence of the groups in each developing aspect of his role as a leader.

An Adult Class Is a Friendly Class

With the institutional compulsions and competitive spirit of full-time youth education out of the picture, the adult class is potentially a place of companionable learning.

In the conventional class dominated by the spirit of institutional discipline, lines of contact and communication extend from teacher to student and back, as in the case of traditional lecture and recitation. In the adult class, the lines of communication should extend from student to student as well, with the teacher seen not as the dominating leader who directs from outside and above, but as the participating leader who guides from within and is at the same social level as the students.

This does not mean that occasional extended expositions on the part of the instructor or even individual oral responses to questions (as in the case of drills in a foreign language class) are excluded in the adult class, but it does mean that when used these techniques must be seen by students as arising out of the specific needs of the situation.

In the same way, a discussion must be felt by the participants to be appropriate to needs of the moment. Lectures that fail to achieve empathy with the hearers, recitations that degenerate into repetitive regurgitations of wearisome fragments of mechanized exercises, discussions that wander aimlessly in a welter of shared ignorance are as inappropriate to adult education as to any other.

The successful adult class achieves a productive interaction of individuals through the medium of shared learnings and the meeting of minds. Its atmosphere is informal without being disorganized; the group is guided without being dominated; the student feels himself part of the group without being submerged by it.

In this view, the instructor emerges as the helpful neighbor who, having achieved acceptance by his social equals as their teacher, guides them in shared learning activities. The student emerges as the self-motivated adult, seeking personal enrichment through further education, who willingly participates in these activities in a spirit of intellectual companionship. Pervading all is the consciousness of growth.

II

Evaluating Adult Education Courses

How can the validity of adult education be determined? To what extent can we discover whether any given class or individual has received heightened self-direction, intellectual enrichment, and skill in comprehending and managing the problems of modern living? How can we judge the effectiveness of a type of education that is not dominated by the notion that each student must meet institutionally determined standards of knowledge of organized subject matter?

In looking for the answer, we must keep in mind the nature of our student population. We must remember their heterogeneity of age, motivation, experience, educational background, sophistication. Since they seek further education because of a self-determined need, any measurement of the success of their effort must be in terms of their own growth. They need to be measured, therefore, not so much against an institutionally predetermined standard, and not so much against one individual as compared with another, but against standards appropriate to their own experience and aspirations. They need to be compared with themselves as they were before the process of learning was begun.

If this principle is accepted, several implications follow:

1. Standards of achievment can have as much variation as is appropriate to the needs and aspirations of each student. Translated into familiar institutional terms, this means that the same "passing grade" is

not applicable to all.

2. Each student participates in the process of his own evaluation, not only in the application of standards, but in their actual determination. Translated into the conventional, he helps to "mark his own papers."

3. The usual measuring devices of institutional discipline such as uniform examinations, graded exercises, percentage and letter grades, are of very limited usefulness.

Each to His Own

The adult class in modern art will again serve as an illustration. It is obvious that the "just curious" housewife cannot be measured against the same standard as the compositor, the Sunday painter, the art gallery habitué, the collector of art reproductions. These different people may have achieved acceptable growth through the course if each, in turn, began to find pleasure in visiting art galleries, took up painting as a hobby, enrolled in a studio art class to improve his painting, decided to buy a painting for his home, became interested in the literature on aesthetics and the philosophy of art. For each, the measure of success is unique to his own background and to his own aspirations.

Similarly, it is the individual's prerogative to set his own standard of achievement. He may be guided, of course, but it must finally be his own. If the "just curious" housewife feels that visiting art galleries is not enough and buys a set of paints, easel, and canvas, and enrolls in the art school, success in learning how to paint pictures is the standard of evaluation that she has set for herself.

On the other hand, if her state of being "just curious" develops into a state of being "just not interested" and she is content now to seek other avenues of casual enrichment, finding out enough about art to judge whether or not it is something she might become interested in is the standard appropriate to her aspirations.

A good adult group has evaluation built into its learning activities. The process of evaluation itself is a good learning activity. This is especially true if the students participate in the planning of the work. Through planning, goals are set. Through evaluation, the degree of goal achievement is judged. If students participate in the planning as well as in the carrying out, then their participation in the evaluation is a natural and desirable consequence.

"Was this trip to the museum worth the effort?" "How much more do we know about abstract symbolism than we did before?" "Do we understand the non-objective style of painting any better now?" "Do we like it any more, now that we understand it better?" "What exactly have we learned?" "Where do we go from here?" Such questions are characteristic of the learning of an adult group conscious of its goals and critical of the degree of their attainment.

Conventional statistical means are not effective in determining the worth of an adult learning project. (Exceptions must be made, of course, with regard to a specific skill, such as learning to take shorthand at 120 words per minute.) Student expressions of satisfaction or dissatisfaction, reports of observers of group sessions, retrospective accounts of activities with evaluative comments are more to the point, if less susceptible to statistical analysis.

However, there are some simple statistics, which are often used as an indicator of effectiveness, that have both strength and weakness. Persistence of attendance is one of these; re-enrollment is another. A course beginning with 25 students and ending with close to the same number, with consistently high attendance throughout the semester, is usually assumed to have been successful. Conversely, the course with steadily declining attendance, ending with a small fraction of the number with which it began, is likely to have been found seriously wanting.

On the other hand, it is possible that the factors preventing the adult from attending regularly may have little relation to the course itself. Extraordinary demands of his full-time job or family responsibilities may have interfered.

When one attempts to use the persistency of enrollment as an indication of program effectiveness and student satisfaction, additional limitations must be considered. The woman in whom the one art course kindled an interest in visiting art galleries and museums does not necessarily need another course to develop her interest further. The Sunday painter may feel that this one course has given him all the stimulus he needed to broaden his scope in painting, and he may not be back in another course for quite a while. He is too busy pursuing his hobby. Conversely, persistency in enrollment is not necessarily an indication of effectiveness. The adult who keeps coming term after term may be demonstrating his inadequacy to live his own life and may find in continuing education indefi-

2

nitely prolonged a way of compensating for this lack in himself.

For another, it may mean just the opposite; for him the intellectual fellowship of adult learning groups is a continuing source of self-satisfaction, and he continues to enroll because he thrives on the particular challenge that this kind of activity affords.

The woman who was led into reading works in aesthetics and the philosophy of art may be perfectly content for some time to pursue her new-found interest by herself. She may be back another time years later, seeking further enrichment in a course in philosophy, or she may not. Figures on persistency of enrollment become meaningful only when accompanied by the discovered reasons as they apply to a sufficient number of individual cases. Accordingly, at course end, and upon enrollment of old students in new courses, questionnaires seeking information about the students' satisfactions and dissatisfactions, their reasons for continuing or not continuing, can be most useful in assessing course and program effectiveness.

To Grade or Not To Grade

Every discussion of student evaluation runs into the question of grades. Our schools are so grade-conscious that many people find it difficult to conceive of any valid education without these accepted signals of achievement. In adult education, however, this practice is singularly inappropriate. (One must make an exception in the case of students seeking to catch up belatedly on specific requirements of formal education they missed in their youth. This is not adult education in its true sense, however; it is simply delayed formal youth education, taken at an adult age.) Grades, credits, etc. are not only extraneous to the nature and purpose of adult education, but they are an impertinence to the self-motivated adult.

In many programs of adult learning these arbitrary inheritances of formal education are properly absent. If, however, some reporting of the quality of student achievement seems indicated, it is questionable whether this should take the same form as in youth education. Certainly the stigma of failure should not be placed on any adult's performance. If it is necessary to carry upon a record that the student has not fulfilled requirements, a grade of "Incomplete" instead of the usual "F" gives sufficient indication of level of performance, without stigmatizing the adult with the familiar mark of scholastic ostracism. If any distinctions are to be made between higher and lower performance within the levels of acceptability, a grade of "Pass" and one of "Pass with Honors" should be sufficient.

It is hoped, however, that adult education will divest itself entirely of these inherited trappings. Adult education should be its own reward, and the student's consciousness of growth, its measure.

CONDITIONS UNDERLYING GOOD LEARNING

David H. Jenkins

David H. Jenkins, one-time editor of Adult Leadership, is now Director of the Teachers College Group Dynamics Center at Temple University in Philadelphia.

Each of us, when we speak of learning, is thinking about some kind of change which occurs in the individual "learner." Many times we may be concerning ourselves primarily with so-called "intellectual" changes —acquiring some new ideas, or perhaps some reorganization of a presently held set of ideas. Much of our teaching for adults, particularly formal teaching, is directed toward these kinds of changes.

Other times we may be interested in creating changes in attitudes, either toward a certain set of ideas, toward other people as in intergroup education, toward government as in political education, etc. We want these people to come to a greater appreciation and a more positive set of feelings in these directions, not just to know more about these fields.

On other occasions, we are interested in having people increase their skills, their ability to perform certain acts with efficiency. Perhaps it is skill in discussion leadership, being able to say the useful thing at the useful time; or skill in maintaining records and submitting reports, or in counselling others about their problems.

Sometimes we hope for changes in all these ways in the students or trainees we work with. We want them to become different, to be able to perform differently than in the past, and to improve their effectiveness, increase their share of happiness, or be better citizens. These are examples of the final criteria we have in mind, sometimes not consciously, for our students.

In order to explore our present question, the conditions underlying good learning, it is necessary in each case where we are concerned with learning to define as carefully as possible what we see as being "good learning" in that situation. What are the particular changes we are trying to create in the students? And, even more specifically, what are the particular changes we are trying to create in the students who are before us at this particular moment? Unless we can be quite clear about our teaching goals and have them before us in fairly precise statements it is extremely difficult to say, in any particular situation, what conditions need to be created to get these changes to occur. The goals must be defined, and specifically.

That is not an easy task—yet I firmly believe that many of the arguments about methods of teaching are based essentially on different assumptions about goals of teaching. I cannot help but feel that many of these arguments represent attacks on straw men because we have not found it possible to explore with colleagues our real hopes for our students.

Dear friends insist they want their students to get the ideas out of the subject matter, to increase their knowledge of the world. If I am not careful, I stereotype them as "subject-centered people"; but if I listen to them long enough I hear them also express concern about the attitudes of their students toward the subject matter, and their inability to put it into use. At this point their concern is toward the emotions of their students—it has gone beyond the intellectual.

Other friends seem to say the opposite: they express concern about the attitudes of their students and their skills of working effectively in a situation. At first, I tend to see them as "student-centered"; but as they say more, they express concern about the students' inability to think clearly and have the necessary ideas and understandings well in hand.

At this point my image of these two groups begins to merge, and I see them as concerned both with the intellectual material of learning and with the emotional material of learning. Ideas unavoidably exist in a context of feeling; knowledge has emotional overtones; and our emotions occur within some set of assumptions about our world.

The conditions which affect learning must take both into account: the intellectual life of the student as well as his emotional life. Not only are both of these included in the learning goals we have for the students, but both the intellectual and emotional life of the student are directly involved in the learning processes themselves.

Let me now turn to the two points I wish to develop. I see two basic conditions necessary for learning: (1) The student must be attracted to the learning situation in some way, he must want to be there; and (2) he must find some differences there.

All of the learning situations with which we work are group situations of one kind or another. Maybe it is only the two-person group as in a counseling situation; perhaps it is the discussion group of ten or fifteen people; or maybe we are struggling with the difficult problems inherent in an audience of 100. In each case it is people together, a complex of human relationships.

Now here is one basic principle I wish to discuss: The more attractive the group is to the individual, the more he will accept the norm, standards, beliefs, values, or behavior of the group. That is, the greater the satisfaction we get out of the group situation, the more likely we are to accept stimulation and influence from it—the more we will be willing to learn.

The opposite principle seems to hold equally well: the less satisfaction we receive in a situation, the less influence we will willingly accept from it. If we are not satisfied in it, we will tend to reject what it represents. Each of us, I am sure, has plenty of examples in his own experience of both of these conditions.

Now there are three relationships in the classroom situation through which the student can gain satisfaction. First, he can gain satisfaction through his relationship with the instructor; second, he can gain satisfaction through his relationships with other members of the class; and third, he can gain satisfaction through his relationship with the subject matter of the course. Regardless of what we think he ought to do, these are the three potential sources of satisfaction. And, lest we forget, these are all potential sources of dissatisfaction as well.

Remember, too, that satisfaction is an emotional matter, not an intellectual one. We feel satisfied; we gain a feeling of accomplishment, of success, of release. We may gain these, sometimes, through intellectual activity—we struggle with a difficult idea, or a complex problem; but the clarification of the idea or the solving of the problem results in a feeling of achievement and success. The amount of success we feel, by the way, is related to the amount of energy we have put into the struggle; little effort brings little feeling of satisfaction.

One basic satisfaction we can get out of the learning situation is a reaffirmation of our worth as individuals. For most of us this is a continuing need, and it is a need which can be satisfied only in relationship to other people. Our concept of ourselves comes from the way we believe other people think of us. Our confidence in ourselves arises from our feeling that others have confidence in us. Our evaluation of ourselves comes from our ideas about how others value us.

Because, over years of school experience, we have come to see a learning situation as also being an evaluation situation, we are more sensitive about our status or sense of worth in the learning situation than we are in many other of our life experiences. There were the examinations, the grades, the report cards—anything less than the best was failure. And in so many cases we have made it painfully clear to the student that he was the failure—he wasn't much; and down goes his confidence, his evaluation of himself. A few refused to accept the brand of failure and had the courage to seek other means of success and recognition. So we called them "trouble-makers."

Let's check our experience, both as students and as teachers. How many of the classroom situations you have known re-affirmed for the student his sense of personal worth, and how many lessened his evaluation of himself?

If learning has come to mean failure, no wonder we find people staying away from learning situations in crowds. Or, if he has to be there, no wonder it is important to the student to develop effective devices to keep himself from being personally involved in the learning. To become personally involved means exposing himself to potential injury. This is a risk many students have learned to avoid.

How do we communicate to a student that we believe he has personal worth? We describe some behaviors of this sort by saying we give him recognition, or reward, or accept him. Yet I submit that those of us in the teaching role who, in truth, do not have within ourselves a feeling of acceptance of the student as a person will be unable to communicate to him a feeling of worth, no matter what words we say or techniques we use. The feelings and emotions which we have toward our students in the learning situation set the emotional atmosphere in which they must work. It is the overtones of our words and our facts which communicate to them.

From another point of view we speak of some of these elements in terms of security and threat, particularly as they relate to the learning situation. If the student feels under attack from the instructor, he is going to be most concerned about warding off the attack, and be unable to direct much of his attention or energy toward the learning. His first motivation will be toward self-protection.

Few of us get satisfaction out of a situation where we feel threatened or insecure. But we do find attractive a situation in which the relationships with the other people give us encouragement, confidence, and feelings of value. Let's go back to our earlier principle: if students are to learn in a classroom situation, they must be able to get some satisfaction out of it, they must have some of their needs satisfied.

So far we have discussed the needs of the student for acceptance and security, and we have suggested that these needs can be met, at least in part, through the attitudes and behavior which the teacher exhibits in the class. This is only one of the three relationships in the classroom. Inasmuch as these needs are emotional ones which exist in the relationships between people, they can also be met in large measure by the other students in the class. As students find it possible to accept each other and reaffirm each others' value and worth, and as they find it less necessary to compete with and attack each other, each of them will find greater personal security in the learning situation. As they find security with each other, they will also find it easier to communicate with each other about matters which are important to them. And, as they are open to communication, they are then open to new stimulation and to learning.

Building of competitive relationships among students cannot help but make the classroom an insecure place to be in—even for the best students. Everyone must be on his guard. No wonder so little learning is retained; it is acquired in an environment loaded with threat. And, as we do in other situations, we tend to discard as rapidly as we can things which we associate with unpleasant experiences. The emotional tone of the learning situation colors the material which is being learned.

The third relationship in the classroom, the relationship of the student to the subject matter, offers a different kind of satisfaction. To me, the best word for it is the satisfaction of discovery. And, again, this is an emotional experience. Discovery carries with it excitement, a feeling of progress, an opening of new vistas, and a resolution of old problems. Discovery is something which the student does for himself; no one else can discover anything for him, not even the teacher. It is a personal experience.

Now, discovery cannot occur unless there is some prior exploration. Exploration is a seeking activity, one which only the student can carry out. We cannot do his exploring for him. But how many times do we prevent the student from receiving the satisfaction of the discovery following his explorations by giving him the answer, instead of helping him find it? I can think of few things that can be more ruinous to personal morale than this—to steal from the student the discovery experience, his reward for the struggles of his explorations.

What can we do to help him? Perhaps we can demonstrate to him through our own attitudes and behavior how much excitement there can be in the process of exploration, and how rewarding the discovery experiences can be. We can encourage him to run the risks of exploration, and share with him the satisfactions of his discoveries. Let's stop killing what little will there is left in adult students to explore and discover. This means we will have to stop being frightened by the exploration process ourselves, before we can really be willing to explore with the students. Maybe the path they are taking is an old one to us—the same old material. But perhaps if we were willing to take the path with them, and see it through their eyes, the "same old path" would each time present new excitements to us.

We have suggested that there are three relationships in the learning situation through which the student can gain satisfaction, his relationship with the instructor, his relationship with the other students, and his relationship to the material of the course. Following our principle, we would expect that the greatest satisfaction would come to the student as he was gaining satisfaction in all three of these areas. This is possible. We do find situations in which the student is able to do so—and his motivations toward learning often seem unbounded. And may I say that I believe the residential education situation more readily makes all three satisfactions possible than any other I know.

Now, practically, all three satisfactions are not always possible. Perhaps the material has to be learned, but the student finds it almost impossible to gain any enthusiasm for it. In these cases the other two relationships become more important, for if he is to learn, he will need to be attracted to the learning situation in some manner. And in more cases than we may like to admit, I wager, the student is gaining his satisfactions principally from the human relationships rather than from the course material. It does little good to deplore this. It makes more sense to give our attention to the relationships in the group to be sure they are satisfying, in the hope that, as the students work with the material it, too, will begin to produce its own set of satisfactions.

Even more practically, however, it is up to us to examine closely the human relations in the learning situation to make sure that they are not working against the learning. If the actions and attitudes of the instructor or the class members are increasing the student's insecurities, are making him feel more threatened, then there is little that the excitement of the learning material can do to overbalance. The human relationships do, unavoidably, take priority.

So far we have been discussing one basic condition necessary for learning: the student must be attracted to the learning situation in some way, he must want to be there. We have suggested the principle that the greater satisfaction he gets out of the learning situation the more likely he is to learn from it.

However, there are groups in which this is not true. If the members of the group are gaining great satisfaction from their relationship with each other, this may be in its own right rewarding and security-building. But if these members at the same time all think and feel alike, their participation in this group simply reinforces their present ideas and attitudes. And, of course, this is an important function which our groups perform for us. It is our assumption here, however, that we are interested in getting the members in our groups, the students, to change their ideas, attitudes, or beliefs. Therefore, there must be built into this group, one way or another, the differences which will require learning to take place.

The differences which are important are those in the area in which learning is to take place. If it is a science class, some members of the group need to know different things in science from other members. If it is mathematics, members need to know different things about that, or have different attitudes toward it, if attitude changes are relevant. Given these differences, the members have a basis of changing—trying to clarify and work out the differences.

I am not saying that someone in the group must know the "correct answer" or have the "right" difference. Often this may hinder learning. As long as there are differences, and these differences are among people who wish to be in the situation together, we have the basic materials for exploration, and for exploration that leads to discovery.

Unfortunately, many of us as adults have lost whatever skills of exploration we had as children, and particularly those skills of mutual exploration. Under the conditions described, one of the most crucial functions of the instructor may be to help the students in the exploration process. He may need to suggest the kinds of questions which need to be asked next, or to remind the group of some resources they have overlooked. But under these terms his job is not to take the student by the hand and lead him through the learning.

In many classes we make the assumption that the students are all alike, and therefore, if the differences are to be exposed, they must all be exposed by the instructor; he is the only source of difference. We make the further assumption that he has the responsibility to expose the "correct" differences, to produce the right answers, and to make it clear to the students that he is correct. This, of course, immediately tells them that they are wrong, and that they must change. But the instructor has been unable to take time to find out whether the students were wrong or not, or whether they were only partly wrong, or partly uninformed. They are judged before they start, and any relevance of their own experience or thinking is quickly dismissed.

Under this process, the differences which almost invariably exist among the students are also denied. We make no use of these differences in the learning situation, and ignore the fact that often the peer group exerts far more influence than does the authority figure.

The condition which is needed is to get the relevant differences exposed, wherever they are in the group. And, when these differences come from the students, the instructor is freed to give his skill and attention to keeping the communication open among the students and to help them in their mutual explorations. His job is to help the students struggle with the problems presented by their differences as they work with the material of the course.

It seems to me that these points have special importance for adult education, and particularly for residential adult education. For example the concept of the workshop, especially the "living-in" type of workshop, embodies these principles very well.

Through the informal contacts of living together over a period of days, members of the workshop, students and instructors alike, get an opportunity to know each other as people, and to gain a much greater appreciation and understanding of each other. Through their feelings of common understanding and mutual satisfaction, they are able to establish levels of communication among themselves not frequently found in the more formal learning setting. And also, through their closer relationships, their differences can become clearer and they can more readily move to resolution and to a new set of understandings for all. The student-teacher relationship, or the student-student relationship takes on a new meaning after there has been common participation in a square dance or a volley ball game, or shared laboring over the dishpan.

THE ADULT LEARNER

Peter E. Siegle

Peter E. Siegle, Staff Associate of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, also is a member of the Executive Committee on Residential Adult Education, the Adult Education Association, and has served on the program committee of four international conferences on residential adult education.

"You can't teach an old dog new tricks," the saying goes; this despite the fact that there isn't one of us who doesn't learn something new almost every day. When we sit in the barber's chair and hear him discuss the latest baseball news complete with statistics and batting averages, we realize he has learned a great deal about baseball without benefit of formal classroom training. It makes us wonder what would happen if we attempted to teach baseball theory to that same barber in a classroom setting. Chances are the challenge of a formal classroom would prove too much for him—not because of the complexity of the subject, but rather because the very idea of schooling runs counter to his basic beliefs.

The notion that adults cannot be educated has become part of the mythology of our American system. It is related to our "accent-on-youth" theme, which is aided and abetted by educators themselves, who place so much emphasis on the training of the young but who have failed to regard the education of an adult as something different from that of a child.

Psychology has taken up the challenge created by these notions. Beginning with Thorndike's early investigation of adult abilities, there has been a great deal of research on the physical changes, intelligence, learning ability, interests, motivation, and perception of adults.

Although these studies have yielded many conflicting results, they have proved that adults never cease to be able to learn. At the same time they have made clear that some significant physical changes do occur with

---

Reprinted from Adult Leadership, III, No. 9 (March 1955).

age, and that these changes are important enough to warrant the attention of educators.

As the adult grows older, his speed of reaction and the tempo of his life slow down. His eyesight and hearing lose their youthful acuteness, and he tires more easily. If ability is reckoned only in terms of speed of reaction and physical stamina, then there can be no doubt that adults have less ability than younger people. But learning ability, like other productive capacities, consists of social and psychological as well as physical factors. When you want brilliance and excitement, you go to youth. When you want considered judgment and reason, with perhaps less of flamboyant discovery, you go to older adults. Where speed and stamina are not of prime importance, adults do well.

Studies show that the human body has the capacity to adjust itself to changing demands and changing conditions. By making minor alterations in the way tasks are set up, by reducing the speed of activity, by making improvements in the physical environment to compensate for the decreasing physical abilities, the performance of adults can be kept at a very high level. In industry, for example, minor adjustments in the nature of the job and in working conditions have succeeded in maintaining a high level of productivity among older workers. Needless to say, the same principles apply to intellectual pursuits. It is more difficult however, to adjust the conditions, methods, and scope of a learning situation to the requirements of adulthood.

Despite a wealth of research regarding learning in general, there is still a great need for understandings which are helpful in the teaching of adults. In a useful theory, the relationship of learning to adult situations must be considered in several ways.

Learning about Learning

First: What do we mean by learning? Webster's Collegiate Dictionary calls learning "the acquisition of knowledge or skills." For most purposes this definition is good enough. But when we consider the many possible outcomes of a classroom experience—changes in skills, habits, understandings, techniques, attitudes, values, and ways of looking at problems—we need a more useful definition. Psychological literature provides this working definition: learning is a life-long process in which experience leads to changes within the individual which are characterized by some kind of improvement. The life-long process factor cannot be taken lightly, for both common sense and expert opinion agree that throughout life people are continuously changing as a result of experience. But whether specific changes can be expected to occur as a result of specific experiences in the classroom is still an open question for all age groups.

Second: What do we mean by learning ability? Most psychologists define intelligence as the ability to learn, and most intelligence test results indicate that there is a decline in learning ability with age. However, the decline is slight; adults never reach the stage where it is impossible for them to learn. On the contrary, according to Irving Lorge and Rose Kushner, who surveyed the literature in 1950, "Intelligence tests, after accounting for the known facts of physiological deficit, lead to the generalization that no adult needs to be inhibited in learning anything merely because of his age." And, further, "the failure to learn is dependent more on the learner and his experiences than upon age itself."

Third: What is the learning process? To understand learning ability we must know what goes on in the learning process. There are two elements involved—levels of learning and kinds of learning. The more complex the task, the higher the level of learning; and at any level of complexity there are several kinds of tasks an individual can learn to perform. Achievement is to a considerable extent determined by the kind of experiences the individual has had, and also by such factors as motivation, conditions under which learning takes place, and the individual's interest.

Ruch, in a classic study, indicates that while the ability to learn declines in the middle twenties, this is less true of tasks related to long-established habits and more true when the new material conflicts with previous habits. Hence, whether or not learning ability deteriorates significantly depends upon what is to be learned.

Most studies of learning ability employ tests involving new tasks or tasks which minimize prior knowledge or experience. From the standpoint of adult ability to continue learning in a classroom, such conditions need not—indeed, do not—exist. Hence, while some research tells us that there appears to be a slight decline in general ability, the situation is far from hopeless. As Lorge points out, the results of intelligence testing demonstrate (a) that verbal scores such as reading and vocabulary are not effected significantly throughout the age range twenty to sixty, and

(b) that much of the lowered performance in mathematical skills and reasoning in spatial relationships represents the penalty of speed or disuse of function.

A comparative study of achievement was recently completed at Brooklyn College as part of an experimental degree program for adults sponsored by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. Where Graduate Record Examination scores were compared with college sophomores and seniors in a careful sample of colleges and universities, the adults, who averaged age 42, proved themselves superior to sophomores in Social Science and Humanities, superior to seniors in Humanities, equal to seniors in Social Science, and inferior to both sophomores and seniors in Natural Science.

Practically Speaking—

These results indicate that there are significant differences in kinds of learning ability at different age levels, and that there are many possible reasons for the decline in ability as demonstrated by test results: limitations of the tests themselves, disuse of functions, remoteness from schooling, decline in physical abilities, shifts in motivation, and the tendency of adult life to demand specialized activity.

Hence, in order better to understand adult ability, we would do well to change the focus of our attention from the theoretical to the practical and ask ourselves whether or not our own experience indicates that adults can learn what we try to teach them. In the very real context of the classroom a large number of teachers have had extensive contacts with adult students. During the past two years many of these teachers have taken part in faculty seminars conducted by the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults in which they discussed ways of improving their teaching. In the considered opinion of teachers, the adult can learn. His educability, however, may be limited by a number of characteristics:

1. the fear of self, which may take the form of inferior feelings or marked diffidence resulting from his long absence from the classroom;

2. lack of association or personal uncertainties in his economic or community status;

3. fear of others that may stem from such reasons as have just been mentioned or from the bruising contacts of the work-a-day world;

4. fear of ideas issuing, in part, from conservatism, from the sluggishness of routine, and in part, no doubt, from the strong cultural compulsions of our system.

These fears may add up to a tenacious mind-set—or resistance to the assimilation of new ideas. They may stand as a block to the learning process and effective adaptations to change. The adult student may be threat-oriented rather than problem-oriented at the outset, thus challenging all of our ingenuity to provide reassurance and the restoration of confidence. Another handicap is lack of continuity in his pursuit of education, the fact that the adult may be in and out of the classroom over a period of many years, with frequent interruptions or long absences, and the time lag between his secondary schooling and his entrance into our adult classes.

In many instances the adult student is seriously confused about what the academic program has to offer and how it can help him. Unfortunately, he is seldom offered guidance and counseling; he is left to reshape his expectations and resolve his confusions as best he may. Moreover, even if the student is neither fearful nor confused, he is likely to be unused to academic procedures and may from the very first be resentful of the ritual of registration, enrollment and other formal routines of schooling.

On the positive side may be included the adult's eagerness for learning and his spirit of inquiry born of years of academic starvation; his relatively free scope of action, owing to the fact that he is less circumscribed or distracted by academic trappings and campus frivolities; his self-identification with the adult educational program which he seeks by his own volition and pursues at his own expense; his more integrated purposes derived from the hard school of experience; his more coherent life program, built from the socialization process through years of childhood to the rounded personality of the autonomous adult. Further, the various dissatisfactions with himself and his social or economic situation which lead him to attend our classes may strengthen his desire to learn and make his thinking more critical.

Those who teach adults tend to corroborate the findings of studies that there are many kinds of learnings to which adults are exposed and that the difficulties in teaching adults are of a different kind from those encountered among undergraduates and children. The obstacles to teaching are often intensified by the failure of teachers to adapt techniques to the adult personality. On the other hand, the adult's culturally imposed fears about his own abilities are sometimes too great to be overcome with anything less than the most expert understanding by the teacher. This places a heavy burden upon the adult educator, who must not only prove to himself that he is confident of the adult's abilities, but must also transmit that confidence to the adult student.

Both student and teacher must recognize that the most precious ingredient the adult brings to the classroom is experience. In the lifelong process of constant change, older as well as younger persons acquire knowledge, skill, and habits; they are capable of changing their ways of thinking, feeling, and doing, because every adult is a cumulative, dynamic integration of experiences which serve as resource material ready to be tapped for future learning.

PERSONAL THOUGHTS ON TEACHING AND LEARNING

Carl R. Rogers

Carl R. Rogers, former Director of the Counseling Center at the University of Chicago, is now Professor of Psychology at the University of Wisconsin.

I wish to present some very brief remarks, in the hope that if they bring forth any reaction from you, I may get some new light on my own ideas.

I find it a very troubling thing to think, particularly when I think about my own experiences and try to extract from those experiences the meaning that seems genuinely inherent in them. At first such thinking is very satisfying, because it seems to discover sense and patterns in a whole host of discrete events. But then it very often becomes dismaying, because I realize how ridiculous these thoughts, which have much value to me, would seem to most people. My impression is that if I try to find the meaning of my own experience it leads me, nearly always, in directions regarded as absurd.

So in the next three or four minutes, I will try to digest some of the meanings which have come to me from my classroom experience and the experience I have had in individual and group therapy. They are in no way intended as conclusions for someone else, or as a guide to what others should do or be. They are the very tentative meanings, as of now, which my experience has had for me, and some of the bothersome questions which their absurdity raises. I will put each idea or meaning in a separate paragraph, not because they are in any particular logical order, but because each meaning is separately important to me.

In view of the purposes of this conference, I may as well start with

---

The above remarks were presented as a basis for discussion to the Harvard Conference on "Classroom Approaches to Influencing Human Behavior," April 4, 1952. They are here reprinted from Graduate School of Oregon State College, Improving College and University Teaching, Vol. VI, No. 1 (Winter 1958), pp. 4-5.

this: My experience has been that I cannot teach another person how to teach. To attempt it is for me, in the long run, futile.

It seems to me that anything that can be taught to another is relatively inconsequential, and has little or no significant influence on behavior. That sounds so ridiculous, I can't help but question it at the same time that I present it.

I realize increasingly that I am only interested in learning which significantly influences behavior. Quite possibly this is simply a personal idiosyncrasy.

I have come to feel that the only learning which significantly influences behavior is self-discovered, self-appropriated learning. Such self-discovered learning, truth that has been personally appropriated and assimilated in experience, cannot be directly communicated to another. As soon as an individual tries to communicate such experience directly, often with a quite natural enthusiasm, it becomes teaching, and its results are inconsequential. It was some relief recently to discover that Soren Kierkegaard, the Danish philosopher, had found this too, in his own experience, and stated it very clearly a century ago. It made it seem less absurd.

As a consequence of the above, I realize that I have lost interest in being a teacher.

When I try to teach, as I do sometimes, I am appalled by the results, which seem a little more than inconsequential, because sometimes the teaching appears to succeed. When this happens I find that the results are damaging. It seems to cause the individual to distrust his own experience, and to stifle significant learning. Hence I have come to feel that the outcomes of teaching are either unimportant or hurtful. When I look back at the results of my past teaching, the real results seem the same—either damage was done, or nothing significant occurred. This is frankly troubling.

As a consequence, I realize that I am only interested in being a learner, preferably learning things that matter, that have some significant influence on my own behavior.

I find it very rewarding to learn, in groups, in relationships with one person as in therapy, or by myself.

I find that one of the best, but most difficult, ways for me to learn is to drop my own defensiveness, at least temporarily, and to try to understand the way in which his experience seems and feels to the other person.

I find that another way of learning for me is to state my own uncertainties, to try to clarify my puzzlements, and thus get closer to the meaning that my experience actually seems to have.

This whole train of experiencing, and the meanings that I have thus far discovered in it, seems to have launched me on a process which is both fascinating and at times a little frightening. It seems to mean letting my experience carry me on, in a direction which appears to be forward, toward goals that I can but dimly define, as I try to understand at least the current meaning of that experience. The sensation is that of floating with a complex stream of experience, with the fascinating possibility of trying to comprehend its ever-changing complexity.

THE TEACHING OF ADULTS

Bernard H. Stern

Bernard H. Stern, as Assistant Director of the Brooklyn College School of General Studies, directs there a unique project working out an experimental degree for adults.

More and more adults are turning up in college classes these days in belated pursuit of a baccalaureate degree. Many of them, between the ages of 35 and 55, have already made their mark in the world. By virtue of their maturity, intelligence, and impelling motivation they stand out from their younger undergraduate classmates.

A large number of them found their formal education interrupted during the depression of the '30's by the necessity for going to work instead of to college. They are returning now to finish what they had to defer, and their determination to earn a degree at their age is induced not so much by the wish for advancement on the job as by a genuine desire to learn. They want to understand the present state of man's knowledge in the arts and sciences so that they may be better able to fulfill themselves as human beings.

Adults are different from young undergraduates. They have had more life experience, of a different kind from that of youngsters, and differently organized. Such experience has for adults involved change, direction, and challenge over a long period of time. These have resulted in personal growth and purposive development through the necessity for overcoming barriers, pressures, and taboos. In other words, adults have already been partly educated by life. Subjected to traditional teaching techniques, they find themselves cramped by tedium. They maintain that they already know much of what they are required to learn, that they can proceed faster than the prescribed pace, and that customary undergraduate assignments present insufficient challenge to them. They assert that, in the regular college

---

Reprinted from Graduate School of Oregon State College, Improving College and University Teaching (Spring 1958).

pattern, they are subjected to classroom experiences that are inappropriate to adults. They have noted undue stress on memorization and grading. They feel that in the classroom they are constantly "told" what to do, say, or think rather than stimulated in their thinking. Instruction, they maintain, should rely on adult techniques of study, such as research projects and concrete examples of the application of knowledge and theory. If classroom teaching included more techniques of this sort, the level of their educational achievement would be raised.

Three years ago an experimental degree project for adults was begun at Brooklyn College in response to these criticisms, with a subsidy by Chicago's Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults. A special faculty committee was empowered to experiment with a rigidly screened group of highly qualified adults in order to determine how much adult experience counts in a liberal education. When efforts were made to equate experience with college courses, it was found that many adults could demonstrate mastery of the objectives of specialized elective courses, such as World Trade, but that they lacked sufficient training in the broad, theoretical aspects of a liberal education such as are provided by prescribed courses. On the other hand, adults did possess some of the objectives of prescribed courses, such as skills, values, and understanding. It was, therefore, possible to accelerate and deepen their study in these courses by a combination of tutorial service and independent reading. They could meet with a professor four or five times during a period of several months for guidance, stimulating discussion, and evaluation, but they could carry the main burden of work on their own with considerable profit.

Further experience with these tutorial methods revealed that the adults profited more from group study than from independent reading. They wanted to meet with their tutors at more frequent intervals, preferably weekly. They were irked by the multiplicity of standard course examinations, which they found too taxing on energies that they preferred to expend on more vital educational experiences. They were eager for more personal contact with the faculty. They welcomed instruction, but wanted less of the "detailed" and more of the "comprehensive." They recommended setting up interdepartmental, integrated tutorial seminars.

Capitalizing on Adult Experience

It seemed clear to the committee from these expressed wishes that the teaching of adults should capitalize on adult experience and abilities by (a) reordering the materials on the various fields of knowledge to meet adult needs, and (b) stimulating the adults to do for themselves much of the work which teachers think they have to do with younger undergraduates. It would then not be necessary to lead them step by step through all the specific details of the content of standard courses. They could, instead, be assigned extensive readings and other study projects, class meetings being devoted to the major problems, issues, and concepts around which the objectives of the courses centered. The repetition and amplification of assigned readings which constitute much of the "lecturing" in college classes could be left for the adults to master independently.

In 1956 four such tutorial seminars specifically for adults were introduced into the curriculum as alternative equivalents to all prescribed courses for the baccalaureate degree. These seminars, extending over a period of two to four semesters, were in Communications, Humanities, Social Science, and Mathematics-Natural Science. They were comprehensive and integrated at a sufficiently high level of scholarship to permit adults to build on what they had learned from life experience. Among the objectives of these seminars were these:

Critical thinking and effective communication.
Making explicit the student's personal value system.
Understanding the nature of man and society, particularly contemporary society in the United States.
Creating aesthetic awareness.
Insight into the nature, content, and methods of modern scientific knowledge and understanding of the relationships between the sciences and other aspects of Western culture.
Liberation of personality by awakening awareness of valid patterns of cohesion and harmony in the humanities.

The Communication course was conducted concomitantly with the Humanities seminar. It dealt with the principles and practice of reading, writing, listening, and speaking. Communication skills were studied in connection with papers and reports prepared in the other seminars. The course included orientation to college study, remedial communication, and detailed analysis of the principles of effective communication in the various media.

The Humanities course used materials from the fields of literature, painting, sculpture, architecture, and music to study the intention of the artist, the art object as metaphor, the concept of order, the transformation of nature, the artist's vision of reality, and the historical perspective of art. In the first semester the adult mastered fundamental concepts in the humanities at first hand. In the second semester he made a historical survey of the humanities from the Greeks to the present. In both semesters there was a long reading list for independent study.

The Social Science course was a functional analysis, historically oriented, of social phenomena and the cultural roots of social values. It included an introduction to social science, the nature of personality, society, contemporary American society, socialization, and critical issues. For each of these topics the adults were provided with an extensive bibliography. The seminar extended over two semesters. The primary method used was group discussion.

The Mathematics-Natural Science seminar covered four semesters. It was concerned with the interplay of science, mathematics, and philosophy and included such topics as mathematical concepts and techniques, chemical properties of matter, earth structure and history, motion and energy, atomic structure, functions of living organisms, and inheritance and evolution. Workshop and laboratory sessions were included with lectures and recitations.

Adult Initiative and Creativity

Because classes were composed exclusively of adults possessed of a rich background of experience, it was possible to use classroom methods which relied upon adult initiative. In the Humanities and Communication seminars a period of three weeks was devoted to the subject of "The Religious Spirit," an exploration of the Middle Ages. Each member of the seminar was given a phase of the subject to investigate independently and to present to the class orally during a series of panel discussions. These phases included Hebraism, Christianity, History, Everyday Life, Trade and Commerce, Science, the Arts, Music, and Literature. In subsequent sessions the group as a whole analyzed the reflection of all these phases of the Middle Ages in biblical, musical, and art materials. Their learning culminated in a critical study of Dante. Similar approaches were made to the understanding of the Greeks, the Romans, the Renaissance, the 17th and 18th Centuries, Romanticism, Realism, and Naturalism.

The advantages of this method included not merely a marked degree of active student participation but the extended practice of the two fundamental skills in the academic process: the accumulation, assimilation, and organization of data and their oral presentation to others. This method also provided opportunities for adults to learn more deeply, independently, and in a less elementary fashion.

Another device employed in Humanities and Communication was the workshop. This method is based on the conviction that aesthetic ideas are concepts which may best be grasped by intuition. Adults do not have time for the study of mediocre works. Instead, they should be actively involved in the aesthetic process and its materials. In an easy and informal atmosphere they try their hand at actually creating, let us say, a color passage, using construction paper and paste, designed to evoke a feeling of buoyancy or constraint in the spectator. They write character sketches. They compose melodies and proceed to vary them, changing the tempo or the rhythm or the key. They work with wire and solder to articulate space. In these ways they become involved and begin to recognize aesthetic ideas before they are discussed. Then they recognize solutions to their own problems in the reproductions they see, the literature they read, or the music they hear. They will not be frightened by Kandinsky, having struggled to articulate space by using only color and shape and thrust.

Workshop projects were devised to focus attention on the concept, concentrating on one specific problem and the perception of its resolution in the art object. In the adults there was a sense of accomplishment which relaxed them sufficiently to enable them to tackle vastly difficult art objects without trepidation. On three occasions they worked with construction paper and rubber cement on a baseboard. The first time they concentrated on color, the second time on pattern, the third on three-dimensional space. Later, in considering the concept of style, there was a fourth workshop in which the task was to cut vase contours. Each adult was asked to cut, free hand, three vase shapes that were as different as possible. When the constructions and vase contours were compared, it became evident that each adult had a definite style. The identifying characteristics were found to be not verbal, not psychological, but aesthetic. What distinguished each style were the colors chosen, the kinds of shapes cut, the quality of line, the devices used to achieve pattern, and the kind of harmonious relationships that satisfied the maker.

After these workshops the adults examined reproductions and were able to specify what distinguished Matisse from Picasso or Van Gogh from Gauguin. Once they understood something of Picasso, Hopkins could be read with insight and Stravinsky became accessible, for to the adults all of these, despite their different art media, were communicating truths about their own nature and experience.

Classroom procedures specifically for adults were also followed in the Social Science seminar, which was conducted by two professors, one of whom presented social science concepts while the other acted as critic and discussant alternately. This presentation was followed by lengthy group discussion centering around the critical questions raised by the professors, one of whom was a psychologist and the other a political scientist. On occasion they were joined by guest professors from such departments as history, sociology, biology, and philosophy. Because of their extensive life experience, the adult students could bring to these discussions their own fruitful interpretations of social problems such as labor-management strife, racial prejudice, international conflict, and so forth. After this motivation, they were directed into an extensive reading program. Supplied with a thorough bibliography, they were able to carry on this study on their own initiative, leaving class time free for stimulation and guidance.

The effectiveness of this kind of teaching is predicated upon adult experience. As students in general do, adults often exhibit biases and preconceived notions. But their extensive family, social, and community experiences provide them with points of reference for the relation, testing, and evaluation of concepts and principles which they are taught. As a result, when you are teaching adults, these concepts are intensified in meaning and the experiences reinterpreted in their light. As one of the adults wrote after completing the seminar:

> During the 25 or 30 years since I got away from disciplined study, I did considerable independent reading: history, literature, biography, economics, political science—but everything was entirely unrelated, one to the other. For the first time I now see how writers in all these fields are the products of their eras. I see how closely integrated are the thoughts of physical and social scientists, the points of view of philosophers, creative writers, and musicians. Things are beginning to become ordered in my mind; the developments of thought and creativity fall into their proper places.

Adult learners are quick to respond to their own rich and varied world when it is held up to them. They have the will to achieve insight into the meaning of the numerous events that have occurred to them in the course of a lifetime. At their age it is important for them to conserve time. Classroom experiences for them must be pregnant with implication. It should be recognized that their life experience has not been shrugged off. It is there and is meaningful in an academic setting. But their experience has not been given form, and this is what they must be taught.

THE TEACHER OF ADULTS

John S. Diekhoff

John S. Diekhoff, Dean of Cleveland College of Western Reserve University, was Director of the Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults from 1951-1953, and is a former Professor of Education at Hunter College, New York City.

Different Students

An educator of adults was trying to explain to a convention of professors of English that adult students are different from undergraduates. General failure on the part of college teachers to recognize this, he said, explains the refusal of some agencies of adult education to call on college teachers for help, despite their special knowledge and despite the special facilities of colleges. "Adults have more experience than undergraduates," the speaker said; "it is different experience, and it is differently organized." Consequently, the instructor must change his habits when he shifts from undergraduate to adult classes.

His audience did not believe him, or did not believe that the differences of which he spoke were relevant to the conduct of classes. One after another, during the discussion that followed the speaker's remarks, members of the audience affirmed that they present to adult classes the same material they use in undergraduate classes and present it in the same way. Perhaps these appeals of the professors to their practice illustrated the incapacity of college teachers to teach adults; they did not demonstrate the sameness of adult and undergraduate students. Those who admitted a difference seemed to be saying that adults are the same as undergraduates, only worse.

It was a curious experience. This was a reasonably adult audience, this audience of college professors. I wonder what their response would be to a speaker who told them that they were indistinguishable from un-

---

Reprinted from John S. Diekhoff, The Domain of the Faculty (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1956).

dergraduates in such things as their desire for knowledge, their motives for desiring knowledge, their capacity to use knowledge, to recognize the relevance of new learning to what they already know and to their lives, to organize their knowledge, and in the relevant experience they bring to bear on what they study.

Paul McGhee has pointed out that (adult) educators often forget that they too are adults who need education. We can learn a good deal about adult students by looking in the mirror.

The failure of some college teachers to recognize the difference between adult and undergraduate classes lies deep in the schoolmastering tradition. For a long time, whether they use the term or not, teachers have been "masters": masters of schools, masters of children, as well as masters of subjects and degrees. The teacher-pupil relationship is the relationship of superior to inferior—the superiority is in knowledge, but also in status, power, size, and age. It is a real superiority. The teacher of children and adolescents knows more than his pupils, not merely about a special school subject or subjects, but also about most things subsumed under the word "life." In spite of a sheltered, ivory-tower existence, he has more experience if only by virtue of having lived longer. Moreover, he has the authority of many long traditions: respect for elders, respect for learning, respect for authority, and fear of power. Students regard him as superior in one or more of these traditions; he is likely to regard himself as superior in all of them.

When the college teacher enters a classroom of adult students he takes with him this perception of himself vis-à-vis his students. The professor of English does know more than his students about English composition and literature, and they respect him for his learning. But he is inferior in some other knowledge or skill probably to each member of his class. Some of his students may regard him as having higher social status; others may regard him as a fool for working for a teacher's publicized pittance. As an adult among adults, he is only the peer of his students in the hierarchy of age. In power he is in some ways their inferior even in the classroom: by staying home his noncaptive audience can leave him unemployed. For the most part, however, the adult student, raised in the same tradition as the instructor, is too ready to accept the superiority of the teacher and the traditional teacher-student relationship. If the instructor enters the classroom with his usual perception of himself, he may discover that he is right in regarding adult students as the same as adolescents, only worse. If he can regard himself as a peer among peers, he may be pleasantly surprised.

If the instructor's perception of himself is one important element in the relation between instructor and student, the student's perception of himself is another, and their different perceptions of themselves constitute an important difference between undergraduate and adult students. The undergraduate, for example, feels grown up because he is in college. The adult may feel a little sheepish in his schoolboy status. But the best illustration of the difference in perception is with reference to occupation. An undergraduate asked his occupation says "student." An adult names his employment. His frame of reference is not the academic community, but his job, his neighborhood, or the family in which he is parent, not child. He has more responsibilities and more distractions than the undergraduate, and his distractions are not those of college life.

This does not mean merely that study is secondary to something else for the adult. Indeed, it comes after many things: employment, family, home, neighborhood, community, etc. Study is secondary in most undergraduate lives, too, or ranks fifth after football, courtship, beer, and skittles. The significant difference is not in the importance of study in the life of the student, but in the different experience and different values reflected by their different descriptions of themselves as "student," "accountant," or "housewife."

Because of his different experience, differently organized, the adult organizes what he learns differently. He does not write themes about "A Camping Trip with Dad," or "My Last Day in High School," or "My Ambition in Life" with the naive enthusiasm of some freshmen nor with the patient resignation of others. He does not even write with enthusiasm about "My Camping Trip with Junior." There is nothing in the world more important to him than Junior, but he does not agree with Junior in his appraisal of camping trips. We may find equally obvious illustrations in the way the undergraduate and the adult may be expected to read. Father and son may both read Booth Tarkington's Seventeen or Somerset Maughan's Of Human Bondage, but they will read them differently; for the adolescent is in the midst of the growing pains of Phillip Carey, the adult has lived through them and sees them in perspective. They will read Edmund Gosse's Father and Son from different points of view too. The instructor can learn a good deal about the meaning of these books by observing his adolescent students; he can learn a good deal also by listening to his adult students. Undergraduates learn from Somerset Maugham, primarily; adults may learn from Maugham and one another.

These are obvious illustrations, but adolescent and adult read other books differently, too. Both may read Othello and read it with profit; but with different profit. Twenty years of added living contributes more to the understanding of the play than last week's assignment in The Faerie Queene. Nevertheless, the adult in his student status, like any other student, is too prone to accept the authority of his teacher. If Of Human Bondage or Othello is presented to him as it is presented to adolescents, he will accept the presentation and read like an adolescent, only worse.

There are plenty of accounts of the difference between adult students and adolescents and of the relevance of these differences to teaching. Handbooks for teachers of adults list them. A handbook open before me says that adults have a longer span of attention, are able more readily to relate what they learn to their daily lives "by virtue of their greater intellectual, social, and cultural maturity," prefer active to passive learning, differ among themselves more than children or adolescents do and therefore require more differentiations of instruction within a class, frequently think and learn more slowly, and wish to see an immediate application of their learning.[1] These are things that the teacher of adults will learn for himself when he once accepts the argument that experience has something to do with learning and that the adult has more experience than the adolescent, that it is different experience, and that it is differently organized. Adults are not the same as adolescents, only worse; for better or worse they are different.

A Different School

It is this difference between their students that makes the problems of teaching different in the evening and the day colleges. This difference also makes attention to faculty training important in the evening college; for in the evening college there is a large proportion of inexperienced faculty, and the experienced members of the faculty too often have daytime habits, as the conference of English professors illustrates. But there are other differences between the day and evening colleges that make programs of in-service training at one and the same time more important and more difficult to establish in the evening, difficult as they are in the day.

---

[1] "Handbook of Procedures for Teachers of Adults . . ." Board of Education, City of New York, Curriculum Bulletin, No. 9, 1953-1954 series.

In the evening, faculty members have little opportunity to learn from one another informally. Few evening colleges have formal faculty organizations and regular staffs of full-time faculty members.[2] The faculty comes to college, just as the students do, by bus or subway, just in time for classes, and they leave two or three hours later when classes end. There is no opportunity for faculty consultation, conference, or informal talk; the faculty committee is almost unheard of. Frequently, faculty members have no offices, all space having been pre-empted (and locked up) by the day faculty. Classes over, there is no place for the faculty to go but home. Conscientious, tireless faculty members meet their students for conferences in the coffee-shop around the corner, if it is still open when classes end.

Even the administration is inaccessible to the faculty. There is not enough administration to be accessible. For unlike day colleges and universities, evening colleges characteristically have numerically inadequate administrative staffs. A survey of eighty-some evening colleges made in 1953 indicates that 49 per cent of evening college deans or directors devote only part time to evening college work.[3] Fifty-three per cent of them have teaching as well as administrative duties, often in both day and evening sessions. Moreover, there are no department chairmen to shoulder the administrative and supervisory burden in many evening colleges: in 33 per cent, department chairmen of the day division have

---

[2] An evening college with a full-time faculty devoting itself exclusively to evening college teaching and evening college problems and organized as a legislative, policy-making faculty is so unusual that the existence of such a faculty organization in the University College of Rutgers University has been the subject of a long article. Yet at Rutgers, in a college of 5,000 students, there are 46 full-time faculty members (31 of them "strictly academic"—i.e., full-time teaching staff) and there are 225 part-time teachers. See G. Stuart Demarest, "Faculty Organization at Rutgers," in Notes and Essays, No. 11 (Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1955), pp. 4-5.

[3] Frank R. Neuffer, Administrative Policies and Practices of Evening Colleges, 1953 (Chicago: Center for the Study of Liberal Education for Adults, 1953).

"full-responsibility" for administering the evening college courses of their departments.

> The fact that in over two-thirds of the schools the day department chairmen have either no or only partial responsibility for evening offerings seems to emphasize the importance of the evening deans in the control of evening courses.[4]

The day chairman's administration, when it functions, often consists of recommendation or approval of instructors, insistence on "equivalence" (or identity) of evening and day courses, and evening's attendance for "counseling" during registration. (Counseling often means advising students to take courses not yet filled up.) Sometimes this counseling function is omitted or is delegated to the department clerk or to the registrar or executive secretary of the evening college. The department chairman's concern with staffing often extends only to giving telephonic approval of appointments recommended by the director of the evening college. Sometimes it extends to insistence that the evening college give extra employment to the more impecunious members of the day department.

Evening colleges are inadequately financed. If college administrators are to be taken at their word, all colleges and all divisions and departments of them have too little money and no amount of money is enough. Evening colleges characteristically have less money for comparable services than the day colleges of their own institutions. Or they are allowed to spend less; most of them are expected to be self-supporting, and many are expected to show a profit.[5]

In part because of these administrative and financial limitations, less supervision and less assistance is provided for evening college instructors than for those in the day college.[6] Nevertheless, the need in evening colleges is greater than in day colleges.

---

[4] Neuffer, op. cit., p. 3.

[5] Often, however, the evening college is charged only for instructional and administrative costs, not for overhead. This is a considerable subsidy. In general, the evening college is expected to make money. I know of only one which has been allowed year after year to spend more than it takes in, and in many universities the evening college is as good as an endowment, its annual surplus being applied against deficits in other divisions of the university. The dean of an evening college often speaks of the medical school as a non-deductible dependent. In 62 out of 70 schools excess income over expense is credited to general funds of the university. See Neuffer, op. cit., pp. 4-5.

[6] Neuffer, op. cit., p. 6. "The responsibility of training evening

Before examining further reasons for this repeated judgment, it is well to observe that some excellent teaching is done in evening classes for adult students in urban colleges and universities. Evening college faculties include devoted and expert teachers. And their student bodies are made up of people less likely than undergraduates to tolerate what they recognize as bad teaching.

College staff members who teach in both day and evening sessions not infrequently observe that the adult students in their evening classes are more stimulating to them than the undergraduate students of their day classes, for adult students are often better motivated, more eager to learn, and because of their broader experience more likely to see the relevance of what they learn to their vocational, civic, family, and personal lives. Such students invite, and indeed insist upon, what they regard as good teaching.[7] Instructors respond to the challenge. Those who do, do not lose their students. Since appointments to the instructional staff in the evening session are usually temporary and at administrative discretion, instructors who lose their students also lose their appointments. This self-correcting machinery is wasteful, however. It motivates the instructor, perhaps, and it provides a basis for administrative decision in the selection and retention of instructors. It spurs the instructor to do his best (at any rate his best to be popular) but it does not necessarily make him a better teacher. It does not enhance his skill in the art of teaching.

A Different Faculty

Despite these reservations, there is even greater need for programs

---

teachers seemingly rests either with the evening dean or between him and the department head. The quality of the work done in this field depends directly on their zeal."

7. It should not be assumed that an adult student necessarily knows what good teaching is. Like many undergraduates, he may wish to be told what to think, or he may resent necessary guidance by his instructor. He may mistake an opportunity to talk for an opportunity to learn, or he may confuse listening with learning. He may take obscurity for profundity, and he may mistake showmanship for effective exposition. When student opinion is used to evaluate teaching, whether it is gathered by formal questionnaire or by informal scuttle-butt, it is well to be sure what the student is talking about and best to be sure he knows what he is talking about. When the popularity of the instructor is the only measure, it is well to know what that popularity is based on.

for the improvement of instruction in evening colleges than in the day divisions of their parent institutions. In spite of many notable exceptions, evening college faculty members are in general likely to be less well educated, less experienced, less well paid, and even more overworked than their colleagues in the day faculty.

The overwhelming majority of evening college instructors hold part-time appointments. Of 81 colleges described in the Neuffer report, only 31 include in their faculties some full-time instructors. But 19 of those 31 colleges have an average of only 2 such faculty members per college. The other 12 schools report from 10 to 80 full-time staff members. Fifty colleges report none.[8] For many young academics, a part-time appointment in the evening is the first teaching job, a step toward "regular" status in a day faculty. Those few faculty members who do hold full-time appointments in evening colleges are likely (not all of them, but a good many) to look forward eagerly to shifts to day faculties, because of the working hours, because evening programs lack academic prestige, and especially because few evening faculty appointments carry with them such advantages as tenure and opportunities for normal promotion.

Although in some colleges full-time instructors may divide their work between the day and evening sessions, part-time employment in the evening usually supplements full-time day employment elsewhere. Accordingly, the evening college teaching of many evening college instructors is of secondary concern to them, or rather is a secondary obligation. Most emphatically I do not mean to imply that the men and women who teach in evening colleges are less conscientious than other teachers. I mean simply that they are overworked and that their first obligations are in other (very probably "full-time") activities. In some evening colleges it would be possible to classify staff members in terms of their primary vocational obligation and find no group whose primary duty is the work of the evening college. Such a classification would be roughly as follows:

1. Graduate students earning hourly or other wages in evening college teaching in order to continue their graduate work in the parent institution or in another university. Of course their obligation to their careers and to their families is the completion of their own formal education. They teach conscientiously, but the degree comes first.

---

[8] Neuffer, op. cit., p. 6.

2. Junior members of the day faculty, earning hourly or other wages to supplement the inadequate salaries of the lower academic ranks. Since the full-time jobs which may lead to permanent careers are their day-session jobs, of course the day session is their primary obligation, and of course they think of teaching in terms of undergraduate students. Many of these junior faculty members may also be continuing their graduate education and may be regarded as having triple, not merely dual, employment. Their evening college teaching is very likely to come third.

3. Public school teachers similarly interested in supplementing their regular salaries. Of course their first professional duty is to their full-time jobs. Their personal interest is there, too, unless they regard their evening college teaching as a step from high school to day college jobs.

4. Non-academic; e.g., housewives or otherwise employed residents of the community who teach an occasional course as a hobby or to supplement inadequate family income from "regular" employment. Here again it is clear that the full-time day occupation takes precedence over evening college teaching, but there are those who think these people the best source of evening college faculty. Their orientation is to adult teaching, and they get unusual satisfaction from it. It is what they want to do. Moreover, they are aware of their inexperience and perhaps work even harder at teaching than "professionals." (This group is likely to include former full-time teachers and is also likely to include representatives of a variety of professions and non-professional occupations other than teaching.)

5. Senior members of the day staff. These teachers, like their junior colleagues, may be motivated by special zeal for adult education, by special interest in the subject of a particular adult course, or may only desire to supplement an inadequate salary—e.g., to meet the special expenses of educating their children, and the like.

All but the last of these groups are made up of relatively inexperienced college teachers, some of them altogether without experience. Many will be relatively under-educated—those who are still graduate students and those who are not professional teachers at all may be assumed to have had less training (generally) than members of the day faculty.[9] All of them, since the classification is in terms of the primary obligations of the staff members who are not full-time evening college teachers, may be assumed to have at least dual employment. All are overworked.

---

[9] An examination of the catalogues of day and evening colleges made by Mrs. Bee Day of Dallas College of Southern Methodist Univer-

Experience may be almost as bad as inexperience. Those members of the evening college faculties who are experienced teachers are likely to have had most of their experience in teaching undergraduates in the day college or children and adolescents in the public schools. Their habits and attitudes toward their students are likely to be shaped by their experience in teaching children and adolescents. There can be no assurance that they will make the adjustments necessary for the effective teaching of adults.

Different Pay

There is one more disadvantage (aside from lack of academic prestige) under which the evening college operates. Staff members are paid in a variety of ways, but most of them have in common one thing: they are paid too little. Some faculty members who divide their work between day and evening classes are paid in terms of fractions of a salary, based on a total "work-load" made of two fractions. This is unusual. Most teach evening classes in addition to "full-time" day jobs. Some are paid in terms of student enrollment in their courses (so much a head), but reductions from a standard hourly wage for small classes are more frequent than bonuses for large classes.[10] Some are paid by the course. Some are paid hourly fees based on the number of hours in the classroom. If an evening college instructor were employed full-time, he would be lucky to make much more than $3,000 a year.[11] At one large urban college, the

---

sity indicates a notable difference in the amount of training and experience of members of the two faculties.

[10] Neuffer, op. cit., pp. 8-9. Six per cent of the group of evening colleges responding to a questionnaire indicate that additional compensation is paid for large classes; 19 per cent that pay is reduced if enrollments fall below fixed minimums.

[11] Hourly rates in 23 colleges paying fixed hourly fees at the same rate to all staff members, regardless of rank, range from $4 an hour (fifty minutes in the classroom) to $11 an hour. Nineteen of these colleges pay between $4 and $8; $6 seems to be normal. If fifteen hours a week (difficult to squeeze into five evenings, but possible) is a full teaching load, an hourly stipend of $6 for two sixteen-week semesters is the equivalent of an annual salary of $2,880. A twelve-hour schedule is equivalent to annual salary of $2,304. There are evening colleges that pay as little as $3

average salary for day faculty on an annual appointment (i.e., full-time) is $7,704 a year. The same teaching load in the "Adult Education" program of the evening college, at an average hourly wage of $8.22 pays $3,865. Staff members of the evening college "Liberal Arts" (undergraduate, not adult) program of the same college receive an average hourly wage of $6.43—the equivalent of $3,086 per year. Since the day session salaries are matters of public knowledge, we may easily imagine the effect on morale.

Payment by the hour, self-evidently, especially when the pay is low, encourages insistence on an hour's pay for an hour's work, and why not? A conscientious instructor does not neglect the extra-classroom activities which are part of college teaching: preparation for class, the reading of student papers, and the conducting of student conferences. But if he is paid $6 for each class hour and nothing for any other duties, who can expect him to prepare a new class when he has taught one in the same subject in the morning or last year? Who can expect him to assign and read papers and comment on them at length? Above all, what dean or department chairman can ask him to attend, on his own time, committee meetings, department meetings, or faculty meetings?[12]

Different Teaching?

If members of evening college faculties have less experience, less training, and less-secure professional status than their colleagues in day faculties, everything that may be said of the need for supervision and in-service training for college faculty members applies with double force to evening college instructors. Skillful teaching is certainly as necessary with adult students as with undergraduates, especially in programs of "liberal education."

Schooling for undergraduates is a full-time occupation and is their major obligation, if not their first interest. For adults (as for many of their teachers in the evening college) schooling is a part-time occupation and of secondary importance. The instructor in an adult program has to combat the distractions of adult life, and these are more compelling than

---

an hour to instructors—equivalent to a full-time annual salary of $1,152. Neuffer, op. cit., p. 7, includes a table of evening college wages. It should be noted that evening colleges are urban institutions; living costs are high.

[12] Neuffer, op. cit., p. 7: "A few schools hold infrequent faculty meetings."

the distractions of undergraduate life. Undergraduates may neglect their schooling because they are irresponsible—irresponsibility is appropriate to their age. Adults may neglect their schooling because they are responsible and schooling ranks low among their responsibilities. The teacher in a program of adult education must make clear the relevance of study to other adult responsibilities. He must also have sense enough to recognize that earning a living or caring for a sick child takes precedence over earning two credits or completing an assignment on schedule.

Adult students, especially in non-vocational programs, participate in classes voluntarily and participate voluntarily in extra-class activities —i.e., home study—or they do not participate at all. They are in no sense members of a captive audience as undergraduates are.

Finally, as we have seen, adults differ from their children in other ways pertinent to the circumstances in which they may best learn and to the knowledge and skills that they will or should learn. What is the best "learning experience" for an undergraduate may not be the best for an adult. Educators since Rousseau have been fond of insisting that children are not little men and should not be taught as if they were. They are prone to forget that adults are not simply big children.[13]

If there are methods of teaching peculiarly appropriate for adults, teachers of adults had better learn them. It is frequently argued, for example, that teaching "by discussion" is a method peculiarly appropriate for adult students, for a number of reasons. First of all, there is the man-to-man equality of teacher and student insofar as both are experienced adults. In an adult class, the "teacher" may be the youngest person present; often he is among the younger. If he speaks to his students authoritatively, as it were, he seems to assume a kind of superiority by virtue of his special knowledge. But if he conducts a discussion instead of a class, and is good at it, and if the class is good at it he will not only seem to be, he really will be a member of a group sharing an experience, exploring together a field of knowledge.

---

[13] The appropriateness of different kinds of teaching for adults is a topic that needs study. It is generally assumed that educational programs for adults should differ in content and in method from programs for undergraduates; often it is assumed that the differences should be many and marked. But the assumption is a theoretical one that seems not to show up in practice. There is little agreement about ways in which adult and undergraduate programs should differ, and some educators insist that "good teaching is good teaching" no matter who the students are. Whether or not they are good teachers, more instructors practice the doctrine of sameness than defend it. A class prepared for sophomores in the morning, it seems to them, will "do" for their parents in the evening.

A second reason urged for the appropriateness of discussion for adult students is that adults have more to contribute than young people have. They have richer and more varied experience on which to draw. They can learn more from each other. Also, the teacher can learn more from them. Courses drawing upon undergraduate experience (e.g., courses in English composition) have been described as a process of tapping the inner void. This is overstatement, but it is self-evident that an adult is less likely than a child or an adolescent to be void within.

If discussion, or some special kind of discussion, as some "group process" people would have us believe, is particularly appropriate for adult students, training in the method is appropriate for teachers of adults. For the discussion method is in some ways the most difficult of teaching methods. Its effective use is by no means within the capacity of all college teachers, many of whom have had woefully little practice in listening since their undergraduate days. Enhanced skill in the conduct of discussion or in other pedagogical arts peculiarly appropriate to adult classes might well be one of the goals of an in-service training program for members of evening college faculties.[14]

Improvement of Instruction

In the evening as in the day there is more to teaching than meets the ear. Behind the teacher are an institution, a tradition, and a curriculum that shape his teaching. All the faculty activities that have been described as forms of collaboration among colleagues[15] have the advantage of full-time professional concern for the problems of an evening college. Faculty organization, faculty association, faculty responsibility, joint faculty effort, can do as much to strengthen an evening college as a day college.

---

[14] Pressure of the budget gets in the way here, too, of course. The usual requirements that the evening college be self-supporting (preferably profit-making) leads administrators to seek programs and courses which will attract large enrollments. In many colleges, no course may be given which does not at least pay its own way, even though other courses may be profitable enough to counterbalance or overbalance the deficit. In these circumstances, courses which attract large numbers of students will be given priority. In spite of the common conviction that discussion is the best means of adult education, there is constant pressure to build classes to such size as prohibits discussion.

[15] See the author's The Domain of the Faculty, Chapter 2, "Teaching: A Cooperative Enterprise."

With more direct reference to classroom teaching, and especially to the orientation of faculty members new to teaching or new to adult students, a formal in-service training program could be as valuable as in the day college. Without repeating a description of such a program, we may list briefly obvious elements of it which are as applicable to the adult as to the undergraduate faculty:

1. Orientation meetings for faculty members before the beginning of a term, on the analogy of "orientation week" for college freshmen. A few days a year might well be devoted (by a faculty as a whole or by new members of a faculty) to the discussion of educational problems, such as the aims of the college, the structure and purposes of the curriculum, the special teaching problems of adult education, the uses of mass media of communication in adult education, the relationship between teacher and adult student, the organization and administration of the evening college.

2. In conjunction with such orientation activity, or supplementary to it, or even in its absence, a manual describing the institution, its purposes, practices, organization, and such educational problems as are suggested for the orientation session.

3. A seminar for junior faculty.

4. Experience in "co-teaching" involving junior and senior faculty.

5. Intervisitation of classes by faculty members, followed by conferences between observer and observed.

6. Consultation with representative adult students about the effectiveness of the program.

The recognition of the importance and difficulty of good teaching implicit in all these proposals is perhaps the most important training device of all.

Institutional Status

Of course none of this is possible until universities decide that what is worth their doing is worth their doing well. As long as the evening college is tolerated by the university as a necessary public relations activity or valued as a source of quick and ready profits, the evening college program will probably be a tired repetition of the day program or a casual, hit-or-miss, opportunistic collection of courses based on someone's hunches about demands controlled in content and inappropriateness by day college faculties with no concept of adult education. Its faculty will continue to include too many underqualified and wrongly qualified instructors, underpaid and resentful of it, eking out their pay in other employment or seeking escape into "more respectable" academic jobs.

Perhaps it is too soon to ask that the adult college be given the independence in the university system that other colleges have on the same campuses. Perhaps that is not the solution. Staffing would still be a problem, since we have organized our lives for day-time jobs. Perhaps the best way to solve the staffing problem is the divided job—part day, part evening; some semesters day, some evening. Whatever the best organization may be for the evening college, it cannot develop really appropriate programs for adults until it is staffed by people who look forward to a professional future which includes teaching adult students, until it achieves some continuity in its staff, until it pays its faculty well enough so that it need not be regarded merely as a source of extra income for the otherwise employed. Unless the evening college is staffed by men and women doing not two or three jobs, but one; unless faculty members are placed on a yearly salary, not an hourly wage; and unless those salaries are high enough and increase enough, and often enough, to justify a professional attitude toward the job and the client, it is not reasonable to expect the faculty to assume responsibility for educational policy, to strive for improvement of the college and of their own work in it, or to give first consideration.to the welfare of the student. To ask this is to ask them to do a full-time professional job for low part-time hourly pay.

TEACHING ON THE SWING SHIFT

Richard J. Thain

Richard J. Thain is a Chicago businessman who teaches in the evening for Roosevelt University's College of Commerce.

Twice a week, when Chicago's evening traffic is battling homeward, I am to be found heading uptown, across the grain. My destination is not a warm fireside but the skyscraper campus of Chicago's Roosevelt University. You see, I spend these two evenings teaching in the College of Commerce. "After a hard day's work at the office, more work?" some people ask me. I tell them it is not more work, it is something else again. Let me try to explain what I mean.

Before class, I have time to wrap my feet around a restaurant counter stool and wolf down a hamburger and milk shake or its equivalent. Sitting beside me will be two or three other convertible businessmen who become teachers by night, my colleagues in the College of Commerce. One chap is personnel man for a big life insurance company; another is an industrial relations consultant. An accountant is usually the wing back during our ketchup huddles. I am an advertising agency man myself. Management, marketing, accounting, finance—you will find representatives of many walks of business life on our owl shift.

Frequently, some one of us is particularly beaten by the cares of the day and munches his burger in initial silence, but before long he is in the swing of a conversation. Most businessmen relish the chance to talk to men outside their own specialties, to josh them a little, to try to gain some insight into their worlds; we are no exceptions to the rule in our exclusive Counter Club. We are welded by the extra bond of our common interest in business education.

By the time we have mounted by the elevator to the faculty room, we are in a stimulating conversation or, if we are particularly fortunate, we are in a mind-stretching argument. This serves as an excellent pre-game warm-up because the classes which follow are often slam-bang toe stretchers. In the faculty rooms, we get the opportunity to exchange commentary with the full-time faculty we teach beside and the administrators. Here is a chance for the all-day businessman to remind himself of the foolishness of that once-popular slogan, "Those who can't, teach."

Before long, it is time to pick up the enrollment sheets and head for the classroom for a one and one-half to three-hour stint. Most of us teach two different classes a night with a break in between. No matter how many times you have done so, it is a solemn experience to face a class awaiting you to perform. There is the nervousness that even experienced actors feel. There is a sense of responsibility that the actor may not experience. Somehow, the boss-employee relationship is not analogous, nor is this a father-son proposition, but it shares in the awesome implications of both these types of responsibility. Once you have succeeded in getting the first student to offer a question or suggestion, the tension vanishes. The awkward Herr Professor relationship melts away in the face of conversational interchange of ideas.

Many Kinds of Students

The student over in the far corner of the room is an accountant with his eyes on the coveted C.P.A. His questions about advertising often have to do with expenditures and returns, but they are usually incisive. Advertising men need the accountants to keep them on the ground. This lad, who is acquainting himself with advertising and marketing, is not likely to come out the stereotyped controller of Executive Suite, unable to see markets for the dollar trees.

Right up in the front row sits a young salesman. If he can part with his chewing gum without losing his exuberance, he will be a top sales manager. From his schooling, he is gaining a view of the business operations which lie behind his front-line exchanges with his customers.

In the middle of the room sits the graduate of a good liberal arts school. His ability at expression and his background will serve him well, but he needs the feel of the world of commerce beyond the comparatively narrow scope of his new job.

Over against the wall sits someone's private secretary, and probably a darn good one too. She is picking up the knowledge which will take her far beyond the limits of secretarial science. She will be equipped to join the battalions of white-collar gals who are winning their places in management ranks.

To her right sits a spruce young career army officer. There is a lot that goes on in today's army beyond commanding troops, and this lad is training himself for a role with that business giant in khaki.

How about the young man who falls asleep in class? There is no use pretending such traditional characters do not exist. Everybody is pretty well knocked out at the end of the day. The nodders are a challenge to the teachers—a reminder to him that, electrified as he may be by the sound of his own voice, it may produce quite an opposite effect upon others.

In truth, one soon discovers that the way to keep a student awake is to involve him. The methods employed in most schools of commerce or business today, particularly on advanced levels, show a distinct kinship with the case method of study originally developed at Harvard. This does not necessarily imply discipleship to Harvard, however much she may deserve it. The plain fact of the matter is that having students work on actual business cases, and throwing on them the responsibility of hewing out their own approaches, is the best way of building mental sinew and simulating the real thing. Also it has the desirable effect of getting everyone talking, of relieving the teacher of the burden of steady lecturing, and of creating the milieu in which business decisions are made.

Teaching Techniques

For the business man who can teach night school, the classroom exchanges and the preparatory reading are of real value. No two classes attack a problem in the same way. The case, as approached one year by a group will take on entirely new dimensions and colorations with another class another year. The instructor is forced out of the narrow specialization of his own job, forced to refine his own experience and to draw upon it, and forced to orient himself in the broad world before he can orient his students.

The night school instructor naturally is there to give the class the benefit of his own background. There are facets of this background which cannot be brought to students by full-time instructors. To a certain extent he is called upon to be immediately topical and to delineate technique, but most of us try to escape mere trade school approaches. The challenge of working with a relatively seasoned, mature group of students forces the evening school instructor, beyond being a mere technician, into development of a business philosophy. There seems little doubt that a society in which business plays such a part must produce men whose thinking goes beyond techniques.

Night School vs. Day School

How does the night school student in the modern university business curriculum compare with the full-time day student? Well, those of us who have taught in both categories seem generally agreed that the evening man is more mature, often more serious, often more fully aware that today, more than ever before, education, both liberal and occupational, is a most important species of property and source of satisfaction. The schools generally proceed on the theory that the night scholars can handle classes which demand the same work as day school counterparts.

In a night school a teacher feels the strong pulse of Americans of ability, who are making social and economic opportunities for themselves. Many of the brightest students have been the sons of unskilled laborers. Only those institutions which make it possible for a student to work full time and go to school, too, can permit the majority of the sons of families of limited means to go to college. There are a number of night school students who support not only themselves, but full-sized families while attending school.

It is obvious to anyone teaching in an evening school that more than ever before in history college education has come to be regarded as essential to success by America's most gifted younger people. So long as this remains true, we in business have no need for, and no excuse for, relying on any hereditary educated class for our best brains. Almost every night school class is a cross section of economic, social, and ethnic-cultural backgrounds, running the gamut from sons of the wealthy to the penniless European refugee. They are equal in the classroom.

Perhaps the majority of our night owls are "special" students; that is, they are not pursuing formal courses of study leading to specific certificates or degrees. In common with others in the thousands of adult education projects currently being conducted in this country, they are seeking to improve their knowledge and their skills during their leisure time.

Still others are degree-seeking undergraduates patiently hacking their career foundations out of long years of granite. You soon come to realize that it is not mere hope of monetary gain which sustains a student for the five to ten years required to obtain a Bachelor's degree at night. He must be gripped by a sense of accomplishment, a sense of benefit from new perspectives, and he must have come to respect the realm of the mind if he is to reach his goal.

Graduate Courses

Evening schools of commerce seem to be drawing more students on the graduate level. There are always a number in the classes who have a liberal arts undergraduate background. They are adding a superstructure of knowledge about the world in which they work to a splendid underpinning.

There are many businesses, and mine, advertising, is among them, where a broad undergraduate background is looked upon with favor, but where we expect that the young college graduate, after he takes a job, will channel his learning into the more specific molds which only evening school will provide.

Of course, there is reflected in our evening schools of commerce the increasing sense of professionalization in American business. The number of students who are aiming for the M.B.A. and other advanced degrees has increased. Many of these people are in their thirties and forties and in executive salary brackets and feel the need of heightened command of the fields of business knowledge. They have discovered that, though experience may be the best teacher, it is not enough. They are cognizant that through the symbols of language, through books, lectures, and classroom interchange, the businessman can be the beneficiary of a thousand times more experience than he could possibly hope to amass through personal experience.

A final student grouping would include the "short-course" or "cram-course" students, as they are often known. They are usually studying for some occupational designation of importance. Perhaps the grand-daddy of such courses is the C.P.A. review session. But they have come to be joined in recent years by other business groups that have established high standards which demand that applicants pass thorough examination before certification.

The Businessman as a Teacher

With university enrollments of all kinds on the increase again, and with the recognition by most metropolitan universities of an obligation and opportunity to serve the commerce of the area by providing evening school facilities, it becomes obvious that these universities must turn to the ranks of the business community itself for many of their teachers. Most of the schools do not have the funds to hire full-time staffs large enough to serve both the day and night shifts—even if this were desirable. Such a procedure is not necessarily desirable.

The enrichment which comes to any faculty from the infusion of part-time teachers recruited from the business community seems obvious. Our full-time teachers of business are usually the first to recognize this. Though many of them are intimately associated with the business community and spend part of their time doing consulting work for business and industry, they are not businessmen, and do not paint themselves as such. How much broader experience a faculty can offer its students when that faculty is extended by part-timers with a diversity of experience within a wide number of fields. The university owes both theory and practice to its students. The combination of full-time academicians and full-time businessmen on faculties is bound to produce a cross-fertilization of ideas and approaches that is a better mixture for the evening school students.

Nor is the practice of infusing business blood into the faculties limited to night schools. There are part-time lecturers from business and industry serving on the day shifts. When you add to these the special lecturers who are brought into schools or who address field tours, the modern commerce student is hearing the voice of the outside business and industry with regularity. It can no longer be said that university training is "purely theoretical."

The evening school of commerce stands as an outgrowth of the realization that a man never "completes" his education. It partakes of the general adult education movement to be sure, but more specially it is a reflection of the physical inability of day schools, of four-year curricula, and also of business and industry on-the-job training to provide all the training, the skills, and the orientation which is needed in our complex economic society today.

Who are we who teach part-time in the night schools? Usually we are men of some seasoning in our callings on top of fairly substantial academic backgrounds. Many of us taught for a time during or after college. Most of us have at least one advanced degree in our quivers; quite a few of us hold doctorates. There are a surprising number in business and industry today who meet these requirements.

Why do we teach? In some cases it may be for the money, but the stipends being what they are compared to the outlay of time, we could scarcely hope to break even. The average night school instructor teaching six hours a week will put at least another six into preparation, working with students, grading, etc.

Teaching may mean prestige for some of us, but it seems dubious that there is enough status attached to such a pursuit to attract many.

The rewards include the psychic satisfactions of creative contributions to the lives of others and to our society, something we all need and, rightly or wrongly, often find lacking in our lives. Then there is the genuine thrill of exchanging reactions with students, faculty, and administrators in the university. There is the opportunity to shed the shackles of specialization and to identify with the broader community. Just as the businessman lecturing in a university may bring in the fresh air from the outside, so he brings back to his desk the fresh air of free inquiry.

Then there is that prime satisfaction which falls to the lot of any teacher—and it happened to me the other day. I read in one of the journals of my trade that a graduate student of mine from the year before last had won himself a fine job. The thrill is poignant, believe me.

All in all, I would advise any qualified businessman to jump at the opportunity to teach in a good university night school. He will come out a better, broader businessman and citizen for it. It is the teacher who will receive the education here.

And, Algerish as it may sound, there is not a doubt in my mind that many a battle to be won by our world-important economy is being planned tonight in a classroom.

ERIC Clearinghouse

FEB 25 1969

on Adult Education

(Continued from inside front cover)

Miller, Harry L. "Why Don't We Have Better Teaching for Adults?" *Adult Education*, Vol. VII, No. 2 (Winter, 1957).

Phelps, Reginald H. "Two Bushels of Wheat," *Harvard Alumni Bulletin*, September 26, 1959.

Schueler, Herbert. "The Method of Adult Education," *Adult Leadership*, April, 1957.

Schwertman, John B. "General Education and Specialized Education: A New Notion about Their Relationship," *Journal of General Education*, Vol. IX, No. 1 (October, 1955).

Siegle, Peter E. "Kitsch and U," *Food for Thought*, December, 1959.

Siegle, Peter E. "The Adult Learner," *Adult Leadership*, March, 1955.

Siegle, Peter E. "The International Conference on Residential Adult Education," *Adult Education*, Winter, 1956.

Siegle, Peter E. "Something for Everyone," *Vassar Alumnae Magazine*, March, 1957.

Siegle, Peter E., and Torrence, Andrew P. "Adult Education—A Polemic," *Negro Educational Review*, July–October, 1959.

Smith, Huston. "Teaching to a Camera," *Educational Record*, Vol. XXXVII, No. 1 (January, 1956).

Storr, Richard J. "The Public Conscience of the University," *Harvard Educational Review*, Vol. XXVI, No. 1 (Winter, 1956).

OTHERS

Liberal Education in a Technical Age: A Survey by the National Institute of Adult Education. London: Max Parrish [illegible]00.

John P. Dyer. *Ivory Towers in the Market Place: The Evening College in America.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill. $3.00.

Robert J. Blakely. *Adult Education in a Free Society*. Toronto: Guardian Bird Publications, 1958. $2.75.

NOTES AND ESSAYS

(Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4, 7, and 8 permanently out of print.)

5. "Television and the University." A report of the Committee on Educational Television of the University of Chicago.
6. Paul A. McGhee. "A School for Optimists." August, 1953.
9. C. Wright Mills. "Mass Society and Liberal Education." June, 1954.
10. Daniel I. Malamud. "A Participant-Observer Approach to the Teaching of Human Relations Classes." February, 1955.
11. Stuart Demarest, Galway Kinnell, and Alvin Johnson. "New Directions in University Adult Education: A Symposium." March, 1955.
12. Gardner Murphy and Raymond Kuhlen. "Psychological Views of Adult Needs." April, 1955.
13. John S. Diekhoff. "Schooling for Maturity." May, 1955.
14. Royce S. Pitkin. "The Residential School in Adult Education." March, 1956.
15. "Professional Preparation of Adult Educators: A Symposium." December, 1956.
16. K. T. Elsdon. "Reality and Purpose: A Visitor's Reflection on Some Aspects of American Adult Education." May, 1957.
17. James E. Crimi. "Adult Education in the Liberal Arts Colleges." September, 1957.
18. "Liberal Education." Summary of a Discussion by the Trustees of the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching (reprinted from the 1955–56 Annual Report). September, 1957.
19. James B. Whipple. "Especially for Adults." October, 1957.
20. Burton R. Clark. "The Marginality of Adult Education." June, 1958.
21. John B. Schwertman. "I Want Many Lodestars." September, 1958.
22. Ida and William Hill. "Learning and Teaching through Discussion." September, 1958.
23. "Pleasures in Learning." December, 1958.
24. Cyril O. Houle. "Major Trends in Higher Adult Education." March, 1959.
25. Marc Belth and Herbert Schueler. "Liberal Education for Adults Re-examined: The Queens College Program." April, 1959.
26. Hans Simons. "Higher Adult Education: Its Place and Its Function." November, 1959.
27. Paul H. Sheats. "A Report on University Adult Education in Australia and New Zealand." January, 1960.
28. Harry S. Broudy. "Aims in Adult Education. I. A Realist View." January, 1960.
29. Robert H. Schacht. "Week-End Learning in the U.S.A." April, 1960.
30. A. A. Liveright. "Adult Education in Colleges and Universities" and Harry L. Miller. "Liberal Adult Education." April, 1960.
31. Cyril O. Houle. "Adult Education in the British West Indies." May, 1960.
32. Marilyn V. Miller. "On Teaching Adults: An Anthology." May, 1960.